DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 376 430 CS 011 872

AUTHOR	Mason, Ronald B.
TITLE	A Study Comparing Two Methods (Teacher Directed Skills and Collaborative) of Teaching Reading Comprehension to College Reading Improvement Students in a CUNY Four Year College.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	193p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Comparative Analysis; *Cooperative Learning; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Reading Improvement; Reading Research; *Reading Skills; *Remedial Reading; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	City University of New York John Jay College

ABSTRACT

A study compared the effectiveness of collaborative teaching and the more traditional skills based approach to remedial reading instruction. The Descriptive Test of Language Skills (DTLS) was used as a placement/exit test and a pre/posttest instrument. Two instructors taught a total of 50 subjects (who were good decoders but poor comprehenders) in four Communication Skills 101 classes at John Jay College (City University of New York). Each instructor taught one class employing the teacher-led bottom-up approach (skills method) and one class using the interactive, collaborative teaching approach. Results indicated that: (1) approximately one-third of the subjects were able to pass the DTLS at the end of the semester; (2) students taught using the collaborative method scored lower on pretests than students taught using the skills method; (3) the collaborative method was not statistically significantly better than the skills method in improving students' DTLS scores; (4) the teacher variable was significant on scores on the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test, but not on the DTLS; (5) whether they passed or failed the DTLS, students in the collaborative group found the instructional approach to be more to their liking than the skills group; (6) "teacher A" adhered to the structure for skills classes and had more success with the skills method when adjusted posttest scores were considered; and (7) "teacher B" adhered more closely to the intended lesson structure for collaborative classes, but teacher A had more success with the collaborative method. (Contains 235 references and 11 tables of data. Appendixes present data, survey instruments, study guides, and syllabi.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 376 430

A STUDY COMPARING TWO METHODS (TEACHER DIRECTED SKILLS AND COLLABORATIVE) OF TEACHING READING COMPREHENSION TO COLLEGE READING IMPROVEMENT STUDENTS IN A CUNY FOUR YEAR COLLEGE

by

Ronald B. Mason

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Joseph Grannis, Sponsor
Professor Barbara Kiefer

Approved by the Committee on the Degree of Doctor of Education

Date____________________________

CS011872

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education in
Teachers College, Columbia University

1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Mason

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table Of Contents

Chapter Number Page

I Introduction.............................. 2

Problem Statement...................... 4

Background
College Reading Improvement Programs.. 4

Program Descriptions................. 10

Purpose................................ 17

Significance Of The Study.............. 17

Nature Of The Study.................... 18

Research Questions..................... 18

II Review Of The Literature.................. 20

History Of Bottom-Up Reading Methods... 20

The Memory Method.................. 21

Step-By-Step Method................ 22

Persistence Of Recitation.......... 23

Comprehension Instruction: A
New Field......................... 28

History Of Top-Down Methods............ 31

Thought-Getting Method............. 32

Discussion Method.................. 33

Interactive Approaches to
Comprehension..................... 35

Combining Discussion and
Thinking...................... 36

College Teaching Of Reading............ 38

III Method.................................... 41

Instrumentation
DTLS (Descriptive Test Of Language Skills)
(Placement And Exit Instrument)...................... 42

SDRT (Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test)
(Diagnostic Instrument)............ 43

Lovitt-Hansen Selection
(Screening Instrument For Decoding Skills)................. 43

Teacher Designed Post-Test
(Non-Standardized Test Instrument)..................... 44

Procedure............................ 45

Data Collection
Quantitative....................... 49

Qualitative........................ 50

Data Analysis
Quantitative....................... 50

Qualitative........................ 51

Limitations........................... 51

Sequitur 53

IV Quantitative Findings.................... 54

Section I
Report On Student Background Variables Total Sample.............. 55

Section II
Research Question 1
Is One Method (Collaborative or Skills) More Effective Than The Other?........................ 59

Research Question 2
What Are The Perceptions of Students Who Score High And Low On Each Method (Collaborative or Skills)?......... 69

Institution Related Variables....... 70

Student Related Variables
Hours Studied...................... 76

Level of Motivation................ 76

Extracurricular Hours.............. 76

Research Question 3
What Are The Characteristics Of Students Who Score High And Low On Each Method (Collaborative Or Skills)?..................... 79

Section III........................... 81

V Qualitative Findings...................... 84

Objective Procedures...................... 85

Conducting The Lesson..................... 86

Structure Of Skills Lessons............. 90

Instructional Phase Of The Skills Lesson Teacher A.............. 91

Closing Phase Skills Lesson Teacher A............................ 92

Opening Phase Of The Skills Lesson Teacher B..................... 92

Instructional Phase Of The Skills Lesson Teacher B..................... 93

Closing Phase Skills Lesson Teacher B............................ 96

Structure Of Collaborative Lessons..... 97

Opening Phase Of the Collaborative Lesson Teacher A..................... 97

Instructional Phase Of Collaborative Lesson Teacher A..................... 98

Topical Set 1....................... 98

Topical Set 2....................... 99

Topical Set 3....................... 100

Closing Phase Collaborative Teacher A............................ 101

Opening Phase Of The Collaborative Lesson Teacher B.................... 102

Instructional Phase of the Collaborative Lesson Teacher B........ 102

Topical Set 1........................ 102

Topical Set 2........................ 103

Topical Set 3........................ 103

Supplemental Analysis.................. 107

Classroom Activities Vocabulary Development................ 107

Teacher B Collaborative/Skills Vocabulary Development............... 107

Teacher A Collaborative/Skills Vocabulary Development............... 109

Classroom Activities Journal Writing Activity Skills & Collaborative............... 110

Teacher B Skills Writing Activity..... 111

Teacher A Skills Writing/Discussion Activity............................ 112

Teacher A Collaborative Writing/ Discussion Activity.................. 113

Teaching Techniques.................. 114

Curricula Sequence & Amount of Practice:Skills...................... 114

Amount of Practice: Collaborative... 114

Concentration v. Timed Reading...... 115

Introduction to Concentration Exercise Teacher B................. 115

Introduction to Timed Reading Exercise Teacher A................. 115

Opening the Class.................. 116

Summary............................ 116

Sequitur.......................... 117

Bibliography.................................... 120

INDEX OF APPENDICES

Appendix

A
Lovitt & Hansen Criterion.............. 142

B
Teacher-Designed Post-Test Reading Selection................................ 143

C
Collaborative Teaching Procedures...... 147

D
Introduction to Skills Method.......... 154

E
Human Subject Statement for Skills Group.................................. 156

F
Student Survey......................... 158

G
Student Information Questionnaire...... 160

H
Design Diagram......................... 162

I
Collaborative Directions For Summarizing 163

J
Collaborative Study Guides............. 165

K
Skills Course Syllabus................. 191

L
Structural Triads...................... 194

M
Frequencies and Distributions of Students by Class on Background Variables....... 195

N
Cell Means SDRT........................ 196

O
Anova Table-DTLS....................... 197

INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1
Distribution of Tables............ 56

Table 2
Pre-Dtls Results at the
Beginning of the Course........... 60

Table 3
Cell Means......................... 63

Table 4
Tables of Means and Standard
Deviations (of DTLS and SDRT Pre
and Post Testing for Collaborative
& Skills Methods)................. 64

Table 5
Analysis of Co-Variance for DTLS.. 66

Table 6
Analysis of Co-Variance Table SDRT 67

Table 7
Student Perceptions: Evals 1-8... 75

Table 8
Student Perceptions: Self-Reported
Motivation....................... 78

Table 9
Student Characteristics
Frequencies and Distributions of
Students By Class on Background
Variables........................ 79

Table 10
Frequencies And Distributions Of
Students On Background Variables
By Method and Low/High............ 80

Table 11
Table of Correlation between
Standardized and Teacher-Made
Measures........................ 82

Chapter I

Introduction

Nearly one-third of the populace of this country is illiterate. The federal Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1986) reports that, including the 27 million who are functionally and 45 million who are marginally illiterate, there is a total of 72 million illiterate adults in the United States. This nation can ill afford such a liability because the human and financial costs of illiteracy are astronomical. Our prisons are bursting with high school dropouts with low reading ability. The cost of maintaining one individual for a single year of incarceration is greater than a year of study at Harvard (Barker, 1990). No one can presume that the United States' economic position will be improved by the cost of supporting nearly one-third of the nation's population presently judged illiterate if they do not receive reading instruction. The existence of reading improvement courses across colleges and universities of every tier including, large private, large state, small private, and church affiliated institutions, is indicative of the larger national literacy problem.

The nationwide demand for remedial college reading courses is well documented. Four out of five colleges and universities offered at least one remedial course in the academic year 1983-84. Of all entering freshmen in the United States, twenty-eight percent are enrolled in remedial reading (Lederman, 1983). Remedial reading has become an essential part of the curriculum for more than one-fourth of the college students in this country.

In the past few years, college faculty have expressed increased doubts about how well prepared students are to do college level work. Preliminary results of a survey of 5,000 faculty show that seventy-five percent believe undergraduates are seriously underprepared in basic reading skills (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989).

The substandard reading levels of students entering the nation's universities presents a major challenge to American higher education. This matter takes on crisis proportions when we consider just how much learning college faculty expect students to achieve through their reading during their college years as well as in later life. Virtually all faculty require texts in their courses and rely heavily on reading to teach students what they need to learn.

There are sufficient data to suggest that students may be experiencing difficulty comprehending what they read. This study seeks to compare the effectiveness in reading comprehension instruction of two teaching methods: collaborative teaching (interactive) and the more traditional skills based on the teacher-led approach (bottom-up) when used to instruct remedial reading students in a four year college of the City University of New York on gains in reading comprehension. In addition, this study seeks to investigate whether certain student characteristics determine which students are most and least successful with each approach.

Problem Statement

For years now the dominant approach to remedial reading instruction has been skills based (bottom-up) instruction. Many faculty are wedded to this approach. But, recently a new (interactive) approach, collaborative teaching, has shown promise among junior and senior high school students. This study intends to examine the relative effects of these methods of reading instruction for remedial students in one of the colleges of the City University of New York (CUNY) on student gains in reading comprehension during the spring 1991 semester. In addition, this study seeks to identify the characteristics of the participating students in order to determine which are the most and least successful with each approach.

Background

College Reading Improvement Programs

Because college reading improvement programs constitute a high growth sector of American higher education, as a matter of professional responsibility and economic necessity, the most effective and efficient means of delivering services to an ever increasing student population is of the utmost importance.

College Reading Improvement Programs (CRIPS) have become increasingly significant in higher education because there has been an increased need for the services they provide in our nation's colleges and universities. To trace their beginnings and proliferation is to record the demand for these services. There are two factors to be addressed in a consideration of the number of programs. First, does the literature show that the numbers have increased? Second, has this movement permeated undergraduate, four year institutions of different levels and types?

The number of CRIPS is of interest because it traces the pattern of growth of these programs. The rapid increase in their sheer numbers took precedence over most other considerations in the literature from the 1920's until the mid-fifties. CRIPS in the literature may refer to anything from a single remedial course to a comprehensive remedial reading program. Bliesmer, in the _Yearbooks of the Southwest Reading Conference_ (Texas), later renamed the National Reading Conference reflects consistently increased interest in the number of CRIPS reported in the many surveys conducted. Less attention was devoted to other concerns such as the types of materials used, staff training, instructional time factors, etc. than to the growth in such programs. The number of college reading improvement programs reported increased steadily from 1915 to 1955. In this country's first survey, Parr (1929) studied 40 state universities. Of the nine institutions which responded, seven reported making an attempt to identify poor readers among their freshman class members.

Strang (1937) conducted a survey of 158 colleges and received responses from 82 programs for a response rate of 52%. The following year, Traxler (1938) reported that of the

656 colleges and universities which he surveyed, 76 or 11.6% reported having reading improvement programs. Three years after Traxler, Charter (1941) surveyed 676 institutions with 106 (15.7%) indicating they had programs. The next year, in 1942, Triggs surveyed 1,528 institutions of which 185 (12.1%) reported having such programs, and 73 additional institutions indicated they were planning to institute such programs the following year. In 1955, Causey reported 418 colleges with reading improvement programs in existence.

From 1956 to the present, surveys confirmed a marked increase in the number of college reading improvement programs. In 1961, Shaw contacted 505 schools and received responses from 350 of them. 242 or 47.9% reported reading improvement programs. The total number of colleges contacted by Shaw represented about 25% of the schools in existence at that time. In 1968, Geerlof and Kling conducted a survey in which 336 questionnaires were sent out to colleges and universities. Of the 246 institutions responding, 210 (62.5%) reported that they were operating college reading improvement programs. Huslin (1975) conducted a survey of 280, four year colleges and universities. 177 institutions responded to a questionnaire. 157 (56.1%) reported having CRIPS. In 1976, Schantz conducted a survey of 100, four year institutions. 70 schools or about 70% reported having college reading improvement programs. In a national survey in 1984 conducted by Roueche, of the 1,452 institutions contacted only 160 confirmed that they had no basic skills programs, courses or alternatives for meeting students' literacy needs. In another survey conducted in 1986 by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, questionnaires were sent out to 100 colleges and universities. It was found that nationwide, 90% of institutions offered some type of remedial support. According to this study, 66% of colleges and universities in academic year 1983-84 provided remediation in reading. In a national survey conducted by Lederman with 1,269 institutions reporting, it was found that 85% of responding institutions perceived poor academic skills among freshmen to be either "very much of a problem" or "somewhat of a problem." Nonetheless, there are strong indications especially in the earlier surveys that many more colleges and universities sponsored reading programs than the responses suggest. Several of the researchers advanced the thesis that low response rates were due in part to a reluctance to reveal or confirm the existence of these relatively low-status "remedial" reading programs on their campuses.

The numbers of CRIPS in existence is an important indicator of the need for these programs. However, this matter is not that clear cut. The sources used to ascertain this information were surveys, but the institutions contacted in these surveys varied. As a matter of fact, the types of institutions contacted in different surveys also varied. For example, in some surveys such as those of Leedy (1958) and Linquist (1949) only first and second tier institutions were contacted while Buffone (1966) and Geerlof and Kling (1968) used mostly third and fourth tier institutions. This is significant because the CRIPS movement started among first tier institutions. So if a survey were conducted of mainly first and second tier institutions, higher rates were more likely to be reported among those tiers relative to the time the survey was conducted than among the third and fourth tier schools within whose ranks the movement took longer to penetrate. This is ironic because institutions in the third and fourth tiers presently have the greater need for such programs. It is also interesting to note that many private colleges and universities and fewer public institutions nursed the earliest programs. Yet, the Parr study was conducted using only some major state universities. The results of this survey was no surprise.

The literature on CRIPS documents the growth of these programs in two ways. It records the numbers of programs in existence, and it also records the depth of the movement through different types and levels of institutions as they developed over time. A critical look at this literature also reveals that the demand for such programs was not limited to any one geographic region of this country. Demand for these services seems to have been ubiquitious in terms of geography. The college reading improvement movement in the United States first developed in the leading institutions in this country. These institutions are highly selective and therefore admit only the most highly qualified students. One may conclude then that even well qualified students with good backgrounds can benefit from work in reading improvement. It is fair to assume that at least a percentage of this need for improvement has come about as a result of higher national expectations for literacy as Resnick and Resnick (1980) and Whimbey (1987) effectively argue. Through a critical look at the literature on CRIPS (College Reading Improvement Programs), one can gain much needed insight into where college reading improvement programs are headed.

One clear trend is in the number of programs. The fact that these programs have mushroomed in schools across the country is a strong indication of the need for them.

The first reading experiment with college students was performed by Abell (1894) on a Wellesley College psychology class. Subsequent to this, as CRIPS burgeoned nationwide, students were first tested then treated. It is apparent, therefore, that there was an attempt to be scientific in the identification of needy students. It is significant that interest in reading skills first developed as a branch of psychology and that there has been consistent effort to be scientific in approach in every aspect of these programs.

One can assume that these programs have increased in number out of a strong demand for them. Administrators and some educators as well as students and their parents have recognized the need for these programs. Such was the case with the first program of its type which was instituted at Harvard University in 1915. The increase in the numbers of these programs is a testament to the institution's reaction to demands of educators, students and parents or guardians in response to a changing world in which the amount of information has constantly exploded. This has necessitated that students be exposed to much more information during the same four years. Institutions are under pressure to produce better informed and more highly skilled students. Professors are therefore under pressures, due to their sense of professional ethics and responsibility to their students as well as to society, to give students the best possible preparation to enable them to have successful lives and careers. In response to this situation, it is likely that a reading improvement program will eventually exist in every institution of higher education in this country.

Program Descriptions

Descriptions of selected college reading improvement programs reveal that with the exception of increased standardization in the areas of administrative concerns little seems new. As previously mentioned, the organizational structure of CRIPS was typically that of a service offered under the auspices of some academic department, most frequently psychology, education or English (Leedy), Schantz Programs usually were sponsored by only a few academic departments, but also through a mandate by special college committees and/or the consensus vote of the college faculty. However, the qualifications of instructional staffs of early CRIPS varied widely among programs. Early program descriptions reveal that instructional staff had little or no background in reading instruction. The programs at Harvard and Amherst are cases in point. Descriptions of selected early programs reveal wide variations in class size, length of class sessions, and the number of times classes met as well as the type of instructional materials used.

Numerous assessment instruments were used with varying cutoff scores among programs, even for those institutions using the same tests. Reading test instruments used in early CRIPS varied from those which used no reading tests to those using the Cooperative English Test, the Iowa Silent Reading Test or the Bloomers Reading Test. Based upon the students' test results on these instruments, the diagnostic-prescriptive method was used to help determine the best instruction for them.

The following seven cases of college reading improvement programs have been chosen to demonstrate the contrasts and similarities between them. They include: Harvard, Hamline, Amherst, University of Chicago, Syracuse University, University of Pennsylvania and University of Iowa. The Harvard Program was initiated in 1915 and was non-credit bearing. Although it did not have an official name (Moore, 1915), this program is continuously cited in the literature as the first of its type at the college level. However Cross (1976) reports a study skills program that predates this. That program was initiated at Wellesley College in 1894. The significant difference between these programs seems to be that the emphasis in the Harvard Program leaned more toward reading, while the Wellesley Program focused on study skills. The Harvard Program had an interesting beginning. It came about as a result of concerns and complaints from parents whose sons were not doing well in their college work at Harvard. The parents observed that "the reason their sons were failing was because they did not know how to study" (Moore). In response to this parental concern and the recognition on the part of the institution, that, indeed students did not know how to study, study skills classes were offered to all seniors. One section of 120 students using a classroom approach was taught five times per week for a total of four weeks. The instructors in this program were professors of psychology, clinical psychology and social science. Later, the Division of Education instituted a course running through the entire freshman year. Students were tested using the College Entrance Board Examination--Reading Comprehension Section. The material for this course was generated from students' suggestions since no text was available. Later, the Harvard Reading Films were developed by Dearborn (1938) for use in this program. This course placed greater emphasis upon speeded reading.

The reading improvement effort at Hamline University in Minnesota as reported by Breyer (1923) was noteworthy because it was a non-credit, non-conventional reading improvement mentor program. The institution determined that its college seniors did not know how to read and did not attempt to read "good books." Hamline, therefore, set up a "general reading" plan which required that every candidate for graduation read ten books selected from a list, with faculty members from different disciplines serving as mentors. This list was made

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

up of those books generally considered to be classics. Successful completion of this requirement was granted upon receiving a passing grade on an essay type comprehensive examination. This program was interesting because it was an institution-wide attempt on the part of the faculty and administration to mandate standards regarding reading and to tie those standards to graduation requirements. This program was therefore different from the Harvard Program in both its scope and approach. Its focus seemed to be to expose students to the most powerful ideas and traditions of western civilization rather than proficiency in discreet reading skills.

Breyer (1923) also reported on a reading program at Amherst College entitled, "Social and Economic Institutions," which enrolled two-thirds of the freshman class using a classroom approach and had as its principal aim to teach students to use the library, read newspapers and magazines, make reports and carry on discussions. Typically, class size was twenty to thirty students. One hour out of three was devoted to reports by students on their reading and discussion of current events. This was one of the first credit bearing courses. Unlike other early reading classes, this course was an attempt to approach reading in a content area.

The reading improvement program at the University of Chicago was sponsored by the Department of English in 1930. All entering freshmen were required to take the Cooperative

English Test as a screening instrument to determine which students should be mandated to take a specially designed, non-credit course entitled, "English 1R" for a full academic quarter. The reading instructor held a Masters Degree in Reading. This program is of particular interest because as early as 1930 it employed an individualized laboratory approach for reading instruction. Using this method the students worked on their folders, practicing materials which had been prescribed. The materials were largely mimeographed by the instructor. Classes lasted for sixteen weeks and met three times per week (Linquist).

In 1934, the Reading Improvement Program at Syracuse University was offered for the first time under the joint sponsorship of the Departments of Education and Psychology. The title of the course was "Academic Methods" and was offered on a non-credit basis, three times per week for fourteen weeks during sixty minute sessions. The Cooperative English Test was the screening instrument used. Syracuse University has long been one of this nation's major centers for graduate training in reading. As such, a reservoir of inexpensive aspiring professionals in the field, graduate assistants, were enlisted to teach in this program under the supervision of a faculty member. Syracuse's early program is noteworthy for this administrative arrangement (Linquist).

The program at the University of Pennsylvania was initiated in 1937, sponsored by the Department of Education with no credit. Those students selected for training were administered the Iowa Silent Reading Test as well as psychological and physiological diagnostic examinations. The classes were not titled, carried no credit, and met for one hour, three times per week for twenty-five sessions. Reading instruction was offered in small groups of three to four students. Class size therefore allowed instruction to be adapted to the individuals' needs. The methods and materials used varied depending upon the diagnosis. This program differs from all the forementioned in its extensive diagnosis and highly individualized instructional approach (Linquist).

In 1946, Ammons and Hieronymus studied the reading program at the University of Iowa. The Communications Skills Committee of the university outlined a broad, compulsory, credit-bearing communications program which included reading instruction. All students were screened using the Bloomers Reading Test. Each class met for twenty weeks, four days a week for fifty minute sessions. Classes were taught by graduate assistants chosen because of their interest in reading problems. Class size was between 8-25 students each. The researchers cautioned against low level goals for students. Researchers found that gains in their classes were closely related to teachers' expectations. The Iowa program is important because it appears to be one of the earlier programs to offer credit for work done in reading improvement; though the argument could be effectively made that credit is granted in this program for language arts generally, not for reading improvement in particular. This program is worth noting, nonetheless, because it is holistic in its approach.

Through description of reading improvement programs, one can only conclude that there is not very much that is new. Early practitioners in the field explored a variety of instructional modes: classroom, small group, and individualized reading laboratory as well as individualized clinical. Programs were sponsored typically by only a few academic departments and atypically through a mandate by special college committees and/or the consensus vote of the college faculty. A number of assessment instruments were used with varying cutoff scores among programs, even for those employing the same tests. Reading instruments used in early CRIPS vary from those which used no reading test at all to those using the Cooperative English Test, the Iowa Silent Reading Test or the Bloomers Reading Test.

The qualifications of instructional staffs of early CRIPS also varied widely from one program to another. Early descriptions identify professors with little or no background in reading instruction in these programs. Both the professors at Harvard and Amherst are cases in point. These descriptions reveal wide variations in class size, length of class sessions, and the number of times classes met as well as in the type of instructional materials used. For the most part, grades and credit were not granted in these early programs. And with only a few exceptions, these courses were offered to college freshmen.

Purpose

The findings of this study will give insight into how we can make college reading improvement programs more effective and efficient. Additionally, they lend themselves to an assessment of the value of more creative approaches, because they compare the effectiveness of different methods and identify whether or not particular characteristics of the student contribute to his/her success or failure. Ultimately, the goal of this study is to find the best method for teaching students to read better and faster so they can accommodate the increasing amounts of knowledge that faculty (and society) expect of them. It is important that all students master better and faster reading skills because they are the future of our nation.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study will be of value to practitioners in the field of college reading improvement for three reasons: First, this study probes whether the collaborative teaching method is effective for a college remedial reading population. Second, this study offers a comparison to a skills based method. Third, this study is designed to identify characteristics of those students who are most and least successful with each approach. Because college reading improvement programs constitute a high growth sector of American higher education, as a matter of professional responsibility and economic necessity, the most effective and efficient means of delivering services to an ever increasing student population is of the utmost importance.

Nature of the Study

The design for this study was experimental. Four groups of students were established using a screening instrument (Lovitt-Hansen Criterion) and a pre/post test instrument Descriptive Test of Language Skills (DTLS) was used as a placement/exit test. A diagnostic instrument, the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT) was also administered.

Two instructors taught a total of four Communication Skills 101 classes. Each instructor taught one class employing the teacher-led bottom-up approach (skills method) and one class using the interactive, collaborative teaching approach.

Research Questions

Every university has many students who perform below their capacity. They enroll in the most selective universities (as earlier program descriptions suggest) as well as in open admissions institutions. Universities can assist such students in many ways, by teaching them to read more rapidly or to study more effectively or by referring them for counseling if they have psychological difficulties. As Bloom, Maudaus and Haskins (1981) points out in a recent study: "It has become evident that a large portion of slow learners do succeed in attaining the same criterion of achievement as the faster learners, they appear to be able to learn equally complex and abstract ideas, they can apply these ideas to new problems, and they can retain the ideas equally well in spite of the fact that they learned with more time and help than was given others." Clearly, much work is needed to determine how best to assist students and whether it is feasible to provide all the help required. Toward this end, this research sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is one method (collaborative or skills) more effective than the other?
2. What are the perceptions of students who score high and low on each method (collaborative or skills)?
3. What are the characteristics of students who score high and low on each method (collaborative or skills)?

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History Of Bottom-Up Reading Methods

When this country's first speller, A Grammatical Institute of the English Language Part I by Webster was published in 1783, it advocated a theory of the reading process as well as a teaching method. This method had been essentially unchanged from the time of the Greeks. Marrou's (1948) description of the reading lesson in Greek schools applied equally well to the classroom practices of eighteenth century American schools.

"The Hellenic method was based on a rational analysis of what was to be learned (p. 150)." Instruction proceeded from the simple to the complex, from the part to the whole. The alphabet was the first thing to be learned, followed by the syllables, words, sentences and finally continuous passages. One stage could not be begun until all the problems in the preceding stage had been dealt with, which meant spending a considerable amount of time on each. This method was hierarchical in nature and was reinforced with the use of repetition and recitation. For the Greeks, learning to read was a way of capturing the voice of the writer of the text. Oral rather than silent reading of text was therefore preferred. Oral recitation of text confirmed that reading had occurred. And, if one reread the same text often enough, then it could be memorized. Memory, in those days, was considered to be a very important part of reading.

The Memory Method

The memory method to reading comprehension instruction delayed the reading of text that communicated a message until decoding was mastered.

This emphasis was evident in Webster's first speller For example, he placed the first reading passage at the end of the book, after numerous lists of words that gradually increased in difficulty as the number of syllables in the words increased. Use of a dictionary, when available, was thought to be helpful because it aided in decoding as well as acquisition of meaning. And since memory was seen as the preserver and incubator of meaning, rote memorization of text helped facilitate the acquisition of meaning.

Smith (1980) described the speller method as the memory-repetition method of learning to read. The central, unchanging activity of the school day in colonial and early nineteenth century classrooms, as among the ancient Greeks, was marked by emphasis on memorization and drill (repetition). Apparently this remained a standard practice in American schools as late as the mid-eighteen hundreds.

The American Journal of Education was a forum for severe criticism of the memory and repetition methods. Keagy's (1826) article in the above publication referred to the speller as, "the greatest barrier now existing to the student's intellectual improvement." Later Morley (1839) critiqued the effect that both the speller and the memory-repetition methods of learning to read had among older students. He stated, "Youth are taught to spell without understanding the definitions, and to memorize the words of grammar, rhetoric, geography, history, philosophy, logic...while scarcely a sentence is understood." Dissatisfaction with memorization and repetition led to experimentation with other methods, among them the step-by-step method.

Step-By-Step Method

The step-by-step method to reading comprehension instruction consisted of three components. They were: mechanical, intellectual and expressive reading. The mechanical aspect of reading referred to the pronunciation, emphasis, tones, and pauses. The intellectual referred to teaching students to understand what they read. The expressive part of reading referred chiefly to entering into the spirit of the author, so as to infuse the passage with the writer's temper, and feelings. Educators who followed this method argued that the components of learning to read occurred one step at a time. Reminiscent of the Greeks, learning to read in the view of devotees of this approach consisted of three stages in which mastery of lower stages facilitated and was required for mastery of the next stage. The theme was "teach one thing at a time."

The step-by-step reading method though indebted to the memory method, differed significantly from it in that the step method recognized the importance of reading comprehension over and above rote reading memory, and acknowledged a larger role for silent reading in the acquisition of meaning. The step-by-step view recognized the importance of students reading whole reading passages, but only after having mastered the mechanical skills required to read the text. This method, reinforced with the use of recitation, was to have a long and powerful influence upon reading comprehension instruction.

Persistence of Recitation

Rice (1893) observed that a large proportion of time in America's classrooms was devoted to the practice of "examining" students mastery of classroom information. Rice's earlier impressions were corroborated in Stevens' (1912) observations of secondary school classrooms. She found that the American teacher dominated instructional time with the initiation and control of large proportions of the verbal exchange that took place in classrooms, most of which consisted of rapidly paced questions usually requiring verbatim recall or only a superficial understanding. Stevens' work stimulated other researchers to observe and describe American classroom practices in the public schools. Stevens' characterization of classroom practices resulted in speculation that she had selected poor teachers to observe because the practices documented by Stevens were generally regarded as pedagogically unsound. Later work, however, largely confirmed Stevens' findings (Barr, 1929; Colvin, 1932).

Bellack, Kliebard, Hyman and Smith (1966) observed what goes on in elementary and secondary classrooms. The purpose of their investigation entitled Language in the Classroom was to study the teaching process through analysis of the linguistic behaviors of teachers and students in the classroom. The subjects were fifteen high school teachers and 345 students in social studies classes. They found, among other things, that teacher-talk outweighed student-talk by a ratio of approximately three to one.

. Bellack, et al. (1966) examined transcripts of classroom discourse and classified the verbal actions of students and teachers into four categories: structuring, soliciting, responding, and reacting. Structuring moves serve to set the context for subsequent behavior by either launching or halting interaction between students and teachers. Soliciting moves are designed to elicit a verbal response, to encourage persons addressed to attend to something. Responding fulfills the expectation of soliciting. The reacting move served to modify and/or rate what has been said previously.

Bellack, et al. (1966) identified teachers' principal responsibilities to be to solicit and react. Soliciting and reacting accounts for 46.6 % and 39.2 % of the teacher's moves respectively. Structuring accounts for 7.7 % and responding for only 5.5 % of the teachers' moves.

Pupils' discourse is distinguished from the teacher's discourse by significantly different percentages of the four pedagogical moves. Bellack, et al.'s (1966) findings support those of many earlier investigators. The pupil's primary job is to respond, as shown by the fact that the largest percentage of his or her moves 65.4 % is devoted to responding. In marked contrast, 15.1 % of the pupil's discourse are given over to reacting and 11.3 % to soliciting. The pupil rarely structures; this accounts for only 1.8 % of his moves. Bellack, et al.'s findings (1966) support those of Durkin (1978), Stevens and Cazden (1988) who reported the persistence of recitation.

Smith and Geoffrey's (1968) study provided a close ethnographic analysis of the events in one classroom. Working with inner-city children, the teacher adopted the practice of "hearing the textbook." That is, the teacher called on a student to read a portion of the assigned textbook material aloud. When the student finished, there ensued a brief exchange between the teacher and the student of the information contained in or relevant to that section of the textbook. The lesson then proceeded by alternating oral reading and verbal exchange. This practice of "hearing the textbook" is different from the earlier, more strict form of recitation, when teachers called upon students to recite from memory relevant material from the textbook. However, since it is still dominated by extensive teacher questioning, many researchers including: Durkin; Goodlad, (1983); and Sirotkin, (1983) would be reluctant to grant it the status of true discussion. Stodolsky, Ferguson and Wimpleberg (1981) and Gallagher and Pearson (1983) corroborated the findings of earlier researchers as well.

Hoetker and Ahlbrand (1969) reviewed the literature on the "recitation syndrome." In study after study, they found that recitation emerged as the primary instructional pattern.

During the 1976-1978 school years, Goodlad and his associates (1983) collected data in over 1,000 elementary and secondary classrooms. Ten years after the Hoetker and Ahlbrand (1969) investigation, recitation once again revealed to be persistent in Goodlad's (1983) A Place Called School.

Stodolsky, et al. (1981) reported on observational data from classrooms in the Chicago region. The purpose was to see how frequently the recitation form was used a decade after the Hoetker and Ahlbrand study, to examine systematic differences in recitation as a function of the socio-economic level of the children served in the school study, and to address whether there were subject matter differences in recitation. Stodolsky, et al. (1981) studied 22 school districts in a total of 58 classes over a two year period. The school districts were selected to represent high and low expenditure school systems which serve children of three levels of socio-economic status. Stodolsky, et al. (1981) found that recitation occurred more frequently in mathematics classes than it did in social science classes. Recitation time comprised about 30% of mathematics class and 17% of the social science class during the first year of this study. The Stodolsky study confirmed that the recitation was still very much a part of the American classroom. This study also found a clear trend between the occurrence of recitation and the socio-economic level of the district. Recitation occurred more frequently in the lower socio-economic schools than it did in the upper socio-economic schools. This pattern is true for both math and social science subjects. The researchers, however, did not advocate recitation as a preferred or sole instructional methodology; it was concluded that recitation may be useful in conjunction with other formats.

Sirotnik (1983) found that based on data gathered from over 1,000 elementary and secondary classrooms, there was little variety in teaching practices across schools. The majority of classroom time was spent with teachers lecturing to the class or in students working on written assignments. Sirotnik noted the persistence of such teaching practices over the course of the century.

Gallagher and Pearson (1983) conducted a series of studies with 144 fourth graders in subject areas such as science and social studies focusing on group discussion of textbook content and addressing the effects of instruction. There was a control group of students who read independently, and there were two experimental groups. The first treatment group received "discrete" instruction, which isolated short segments of text for oral reading and discussion. The second treatment group received "integrative" instruction, which focused on large content units and was designed to promote students' ability to relate information within as well as across text. Students read a total of 12 articles during a 12 day period. A series of pre and post tests were administered to assess factual knowledge, ability to use text as an information source, and application of knowledge in new contexts. The findings indicated that instruction significantly enhanced both the amount and kind of knowledge students acquire.

Cazden (1988) in an investigation entitled Classroom Discourse studied the language used in instructional interactions. Cazden took a sabbatical from her professorship at Harvard School of Education to teach a class of twenty-five black and Chicano elementary school students in a San Diego Public School located in one of the lowest income areas in the city. In this study, Cazden analyzed the structure of classroom lessons and found a three part sequence which included teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation to be the most common pattern of classroom discourse at all grade levels. The classroom speech event described in her study corresponds to the traditional recitation method. Cazden, however, also studied talk with peers and other ways of talking in the classroom. The recitation-type lesson has had a long hardy life through many decades of formal, Western-type schooling.

Comprehension Instruction: A New Field

Until the First World War, few educators concerned themselves with the issue of comprehension instruction. Before that time, most reading instruction consisted of oral reading. The standards of successful oral reading were accuracy and fluency. During the decade of the 1920's, several changes occurred almost simultaneously. Paper and pencil tests of reading achievement became commercially available; silent reading as an instructional activity appeared in teacher's manuals and college textbooks; and early reading instruction shifted from a code emphasis to a meaning emphasis (Smith, N.B., 1980). These changes marked the beginning of a new era in the world of reading in which reading comprehension and comprehension instruction secured a permanent and prominent place (Pearson & Dole, 1988). Comprehension instruction in the early programs, as in most of today's programs, consisted of asking students specific questions about the selections they read. The hope was that if students practiced answering questions long enough, they would get better at it. Before long, basal reader developers began to realize that having students answer questions at the end of each reading selection was not enough. This realization led to the development of the reading comprehension strand in most basal reading programs. So, in addition to including questions in teachers' manuals, basal developers created workbooks containing activities requiring students to answer more questions usually unrelated to the selections the students read in their textbooks. These questions were thought to be more helpful than the questions asked following stories because they broke down the complex task of comprehension into skill components: finding main ideas, determining sequence, identifying cause and effect relationships, drawing conclusions, and predicting outcomes. Apparently, the hope was that if students practiced answering

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

questions in their workbooks, then they would do a better job of answering questions after the selections they read in their student readers (Pearson & Dole, 1988).

Since that time, the practice of reading comprehension instruction, and the guiding principle behind that instruction--that practice makes perfect--remained largely unchallenged until the 1970s. Then, in 1978-79 Durkin pointed out that there was nothing necessarily instructive about reading instruction in some American classrooms. Durkin found that there was little in our comprehension instruction that could help students learn directly what these comprehension skills were, how they should actually go about applying them, why they should use them, or when they should use them. Instead Durkin found that instructors engage in what she referred to as "mentioning" the skill students are supposed to apply; then "practicing," having students practice in a workbook, and "assessing" whether students got the right answer (Pearson & Dole, 1988).

Comparing the findings of more recent researchers with the impressions and observations of investigators of nearly a century ago, we find that in some important respects instructional practices have altered little.

Not long after Durkin's description of reading instruction, a renaissance in instructional research in reading took place. This period of the mid-seventies was characterized by a feverish period of research on the basic processes of comprehension (Smith, N.B., 1980). The review which follows treats the history of the meaning approach to reading comprehension instruction.

History of Top-Down Methods

In 1839, Davis in his book on teaching methods, The Teacher Taught, proposed a new method for teaching reading. This method involved the introduction of sight vocabulary, the learning of letter names, and, after a short list of words had been mastered, the oral reading of short passages gave each word list context.

Davis's method was deeply indebted to the memory method; however, its emphasis was different.

This method gave a central role to meaning in learning to read and emphasized the importance of silent reading. It also acknowledged the need to begin focusing on reading comprehension early in a student's reading development. Some contemporaries of Davis argued that reading for meaning was crucial in the early stages of a student's reading education because without it "reading without thinking" would develop. The interlocking approach clearly recognized the central role of meaning in reinforcing mechanics as well as expressive reading.

Interlocking and step-by-step methods of reading implied contrasting notions about reading comprehension instruction. The interlocking view suggested that reading comprehension was facilitated when mechanics and meaning were taught as complementary instructional tasks. However, the step-by-step view suggests that reading comprehension was facilitated when mechanics and meaning were taught as separate instructional tasks.

Thought-Getting Method

Talk in Teaching (1883) by Parker presents a definition of reading which broke with tradition. For Parker, reading presupposed life experience. He viewed reading as primarily a receptive (silent) process with thought-getting as its goal. Reading, for Parker, was an expressive act when one's thoughts were shared or discussed with others. Concerning reading as an expressive process, Arnold (1899) maintained that, nothing is really ours until we share it. "Our conception of reading is not complete until we have added to our thought-getting, thought-giving."

The thought-getting, thought-giving model was a new way of viewing reading when compared with previous methods. It was an outgrowth of the interlocking view with which it seems to share an affinity. This method was different because it attributed a major role to experience, silent reading, and meaning in reading. It relegates mechanics and expressive reading to subordinate positions. This method also implied that reading must be understood as an inseparable whole rather than in distinct stages, an idea that has had tremendous impact on the teaching of reading comprehension.

Discussion Method

A small body of research has begun to develop concerning the use of discussion in improving reading comprehension skills. There are many definitions of discussion. Landon (1899) equated discussion with an informal conversation having no overtones of instruction. Using this method students are encouraged to converse freely, to say what they think, and to question unfamiliar ideas. The teacher's role was one of directing and guiding students' thoughts by questioning often for the purpose of holding student's attention.

Bloom (1954) described discussion as a "cooperative attack on a common set of problems, based on a common set of data, materials, and experiences, in which the problem is pursued to as complex and deep a level as possible." In (1969) Stanford and Stanford viewed discussion from a similar perspective, they added another dimension "to gain feelings of acceptance and belonging."

Dillon (1981) distinguishes recitation from discussion by defining the criteria that characterized an interaction as a discussion. According to Dillon if the teacher planned to have a discussion, if the students rated it as such, and if at least forty percent of the total talk could be attributed to students, then the exchange was a discussion.

In an interview in the December, 1989 issue of On Campus, Dr. Roy Marshall, former Secretary of Labor under President Carter and a professor at Louisiana State

University and the University of Texas at Austin for a total of twenty-five years predicted profound changes in the way faculty teach and students learn. Marshall argues that dramatic changes are ahead in our nation's work force, and these changes have implications for higher education. "I believe in teaching; I don't believe in classroom lectures. Other than not doing anything, it is the worst kind of teaching that can go on. What I try to do is to teach students to read critically, listen critically, ask what are the main conclusions, what are the assumptions, what's the evidence? Do you agree? I organize debates. This approach causes students to think and to know both sides of any issue"

According to Bridges (1979) the recitation and the lecture methods cannot compete with discussion in offering opportunities for students to communicate their views. Teachers who use discussion create a learning opportunity that encourages students to enrich and refine the understandings they have derived from reading their assigned texts.

Discussion can be useful as an instructional approach for college reading improvement programs because it allows an opportunity for important issues to be raised in relation to the reading assignment, because discussion affords an opportunity to identify and clarify student's misconceptions, and because it is a way of checking who has read the assigned materials.

Discussion can be classified according to the instructional objective which include: subject mastery, attitude change, and/or a public forum for problem solving.

Interactive Approaches To Comprehension

In Landscapes: A State-of-the-Art Assessment of Reading Comprehension Research 1974-84, Crismore (1985) shows that there has been a shift in how researchers and practitioners think about comprehension instruction. This shift places emphasis on the active involvement of students in the comprehension process and calls for teachers to challenge students to question, rethink and elaborate on what they read based upon close analysis of text. This is referred to as interactive instruction which involves both the processing of text and the use of experiences and expectancies the reader brings to the text, both sources of information interact and modify each other in reading comprehension.

While there is a consensus among educators that the essence of reading is constructing meaning, in contrast, students may confuse reading with task completion (Anderson, 1985; Palincsar & Brown, 1984). Rather than restructure their prior conceptions, research indicates that students who possess partial or incorrect knowledge about concepts tend to recast new textual information to conform with their previous conceptions (Alvermann, Smith & Readance, 1985). These two studies corroborate Durkin's findings that students need to be instructed in the purpose and process of comprehension. Though both of the above studies used populations in public high schools, the same behaviors are common among college students (Chall, 1970). These behaviors and the attitudes which they reflect can be modified.

There have been numerous programs designed to teach thinking skills independently of academic content (Nickerson, Perkins, & Smith, 1985). However, data to support the effectiveness of teaching reading through thinking is sparse. This is a particularly significant issue for the remedial student population among whom transfer of skills seems problematic.

Combining Discussion And Thinking

After seven years of research focused on the instruction of poor reader-comprehenders, Palinscar and Brown (1984) have developed an instructional procedure entitled "collaborative or reciprocal teaching." This instructional approach is in the form of a structured discussion. The discussion is conducted by the class members with the teacher serving as both a leader and a respondent. Different members of the class assume the leadership role at different times. The dialogue is structured to the extent that the leader employs an assortment of four strategies to direct the discussion. The four strategies used are: questioning, summarizing, clarifying and predicting. These strategies were selected for several reasons. They represent the kinds of activities that successful readers routinely employ (Bereiter & Bird, 1985). They also represent activities good readers engage in before, during and after reading (Palinscar, 1984).

Underlying the model of reciprocal (collaborative) teaching is the notion that expert-led social interactions have an important role to play in cognitive learning and can provide an impetus for cognitive growth. Binet, (1909); Dewey, (1933); Vygotsky, (1978) emphasize guided learning in social contexts as key to developmental change. Guided learning in reciprocal teaching includes the process of scaffolding (Palincsar & Brown, 1984; Palincsar, 1986). Scaffolding has been defined as a "process that enables a student or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task, or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted effort" (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976).

A body of literature is beginning to develop which supports the notion that students who do not automatically use strategies in learning activities may be taught to do so (Palincsar & Brown, 1988). Palincsar's doctoral dissertation at the University Illinois at Urbana (1982) took the form of two studies. Both studies employed a multiple baseline across groups. All students experienced four conditions: baseline, intervention, maintenance, and follow-up. In Study 1 the investigator worked with six students, in pair, in a setting analogous to a research room. In Study 2, four remedial reading teachers worked with a total of 21 students on a small group basis in their classrooms.

The results of this investigation provide further support to a small but growing body of instructional research in reading comprehension which contends that students can indeed, through interactive instruction, be taught to acquire and independently apply reading strategies which will enhance reading comprehension. These findings also lend support to the role of discussion in reading comprehension instruction. Discussion can be an important part of such reading instruction. National Merit Scholarship winners reported that teachers who allowed time for classroom discussion contributed most to students' desire to learn (McKeachie, 1978). In addition, the results of a study (Schallert & Tierney, 1982) funded by the National Institute of Education revealed that high school students perceive classroom discussion as valuable in helping them understand reading assignments.

This review of the literature on reading comprehension instruction reveals a dynamic tension between skills and meaning emphases in this field.

College Teaching Of Reading

Developments in the field of reading between the years 1826 and 1920 were preparatory to the reading improvement programs in modern American college. The scientific method in education was ushered in with Gray's standardized oral reading paragraphs in the same year as the founding of the first college reading improvement program in 1915. With the development of the standardized test reading investigation took on a new aspect. Evaluation of reading ability became possible as it had never been before. Testing revealed a wide range of ability at all levels of the academic structure, including college and university students. Leedy

(1958) identified three factors which impacted the development of college reading improvement programs. They were: a return to individualism in higher education, the growth of the elective system, and the emphasis on study and study techniques.

In the early twentieth century, college students were subjects in eye movement studies which found that some students read far more proficiently than others. Experimenters such as Abell (1984) and Romanes (1883) found that with proper educational procedures the reading potential of students could be increased considerably. In the early twentieth century, higher education began to experience a renaissance.

Among the significant occurrences in higher education, the role of the emerging counseling and guidance program must not be minimized or overlooked. Counseling and remedial or developmental instruction were based upon the belief in the importance of the individual student.

The proliferation of courses and the growth of the elective system in the early twentieth century contributed further to the development of higher education in this country. It made clearer the need for a greater variety of reading skills on the part of the student. One of the basic principles of reading improvement is that different types of reading materials require different techniques of reading.

With the psychological investigations of the individual and his reading habits, with the growth in college population, with the augmented demands of an expanded curriculum, the need on the part of the student to learn how to study effectively became the new emphasis. And in the most widely used of the study skills manuals, reading was recognized as a most important phase of the act of study.

Efforts to improve learning in college reading improvement programs will not progress very far, except by chance unless universities find some way to determine which initiatives succeed and which do not.

> Professors are less likely to experiment with new methods of instruction or to adopt the innovations of others if they have no way of knowing what educational gains will result. Hence, universities need to continue to make a sustained effort to investigate the process of thinking and learning and to evaluate its effects on students. Studies can be carried out currently that will throw valuable light on many concrete decisions educators are called upon to make. In time, however, continued work should succeed in expanding our list of sound choices considerably (Bok, 1986).

Chapter III

METHOD

Four classes of approximately 12 students from John Jay College took part in this study, totalling 50 subjects. All students failed to receive a minimal passing score on the CUNY Reading Proficiency Test, Descriptive Test of Language Skills (DTLS) which is given to all entering students. Students who met criteria were randomly assigned to participating classes from a pool of approximately 250 students who qualified for John Jay's college reading improvement course (CS 101), which is offered each semester. These students were not and should not be labeled or identified as learning impaired. Participating students are adequate decoders but poor comprehenders. This fact was insured by admitting students who scored from 0-21 on the DTLS when the minimal passing score is 28, and can decode with fluency twelfth grade appropriate text using the Fog readability formula at a rate of at least 80 wpm with two or fewer errors. This latter criterion was established by Lovitt and Hansen (1976) as the minimum acceptable decoding fluency of students reading. In addition, the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT) for comprehension was administered during the first week of class. Students who scored above these cut-offs were placed into a special section which was not considered in this study.

Instrumentation

DTLS (Descriptive Test Of Language Skills)

(Placement And Exit Instrument)

The assessment tool for reading skill level was the Reading Comprehension Test of the Descriptive Test of Language Skills (DTLS). The DTLS was developed by the College Board specifically for the assessment of the reading skills of incoming college freshmen.

The DTLS Reading Comprehension Test forms used in this study contained 45 multiple choice questions, with each question having four alternatives from which to choose. Students read 21 paragraphs and answered between two and four questions related to each passage. Questions were related to three comprehension skills: 1) understanding the main idea, 2) understanding direct statement, and 3) drawing inferences.

Internal consistency reliability was tested on a sample of 830 college freshmen, using the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20. The Reading Comprehension Test achieved a reliability $\underline{r} = .89$, and a standard error of measure of 2.1.

Content validity was assessed for the DTLS in terms of its representativeness of skills needed for college-level reading. (The authors of Buros Test and Measurements - 1979 reported that the DTLS was appropriate to test the reading skills of entering freshmen.) Predictive validity was tested using correlations of DTLS scores with grades in writing courses in several two-and four-year colleges. The median correlation of a writing course to the Reading Comprehension

Test was *r* = .42. The DTLS was given during final exam week.

SDRT (Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test)
(Diagnostic Instrument)

The diagnostic tool for reading skill level was the SDRT. This test was developed by the Psychological Corp. in 1986 for the assessment of high school students and college freshmen.

The SDRT forms G and H, level 3, used in this study contain 60 multiple choice comprehension questions. Students read 10 passages and answered between 5 and 8 questions related to each paragraph.

Internal consistency reliability was reported to range from .79 to .96 for the various subtests. The coefficients between subtests exceed .90.

The author, Buros, reported that the SDRT was appropriate to test the reading skills of high school students and students in their first two years of college.

Lovitt-Hansen Selection
(Screening Instrument For Decoding Skills)

The Lovitt-Hansen selection was chosen by this researcher from *Barnell-Loft's Specific Skills Series Advanced Level*. The desired readability for this selection was pre-determined (12th grade), and then the Fog readability formula was used to verify its grade level. This researcher-selected passage was administered only to students who expressed a desire to register for one of the class sections involved in this

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

study. This instrument was used to screen for students' ability to decode with fluency. In accordance with the Lovitt-Hansen Criterion, students were allowed one minute to read the passage and permitted to make no more than two decoding errors (Appendix A). An adaptation of the Gray Oral Miscue Protocol was used in this study. The following types of errors were included in this evaluation: gross mispronunciations, partial mispronunciations, omissions, insertions, substitutions, repetitions, and inversions.

Teacher Designed Post-Test (Non-Standardized Test Instrument)

The Teacher Designed Post-Test Reading Selection for Appendix B was excerpted from a work by Dorothy Parker (1986). The questions which follow it were developed by this researcher. This instrument is included in an attempt to be as thorough as possible in the assessment of possible effects of the skills and collaborative approaches used in this study. It was different from the DTLS and the SRDT in that it was not multiple choice but short answer in its format. Students were expected to choose from an unlimited universe of options (short answers) rather than from a limited universe (multiple choice). Student interest was pitched higher in this Teacher Designed Post-Test than in the more moderately pitched standardized materials. Though the DTLS, SDRT and the Teacher Designed Test were all timed, The Teacher Designed Test, unlike the aforementioned, allowed ample time to complete the task (50 minutes). It was the expectation of this researcher that this instrument would be sensitive to factors which cannot be measured by either the DTLS and/or the SRDT because they were both standardized instruments and therefore made the same assumptions about test format, testing conditions, and embody certain cultural values.

Procedure

The 50 students meeting the minimal decoding standards (grade appropriate text 80 wpm four errors), but failing on two measures (DTLS, and the SDRT) registered in one of four classes. Two classes were taught using the Collaborative Teaching Procedures (Appendix C), and two were taught using the Introduction to Skills Method (Appendix D). The researcher and one other faculty member each taught one skills-based class and one collaborative-based class. There were 28 class sessions of one hour and fifteen minutes each. Students were required to spend 10 hours per semester beyond class in the reading lab (constant for all groups).

The skills based class used The Reading Skills Handbook by Wiener and Bazerman (1991). Students were administered the Stanford Diagnostic Reading pre-test after placement in the first week. The results were analyzed, diagnosing each students' strengths and weaknesses. Based upon the pre-test diagnosis, students were assigned lessons to be completed in the reading lab. The class sessions were designed to follow the scope and sequence presented in The Reading Skills Handbook.

The collaborative instructional approach employed a total of two trade books. Both instructors were expected to use Kindred by Octavia Butler (1979), and Down These Mean Streets by Piri Thomas (1974). Students were assigned approximately thirty pages to read per class as homework. Classes were taught using textual analysis of selected portions of the day's reading assignment. The teacher modeled the question asking activities and the class discussed them, and in subsequent sessions, the teacher slowly shifted the questioning responsibility onto the students as the teacher took on the role of a participating student. The class was arranged in one large group, seated in a circular arrangement. Each student was given the opportunity to contribute.

In this study, a deliberate attempt was made to select reading materials which reflected the ethnic and cultural composition of the sample population which was 42% Black and 44% Hispanic. Therefore, the text used for those students taught using the teacher-led skills method was a skills based textbook designed for multi-cultural students. The title of this text is The Reading Skills Handbook by Wiener and Bazerman (1991). The first of two tradebooks employed to instruct students using the collaborative method was Down These Mean Streets by Piri Thomas. It is a classical confessional autobiography. Piri is a young man of African-Puerto Rican descent living in Spanish Harlem. This novel records a young man experiencing conflicts and crises as he grew to maturity. The second of the two tradebooks selected to teach students using the collaborative method was Kindred by Octavia Butler. This novel is part Black history and part science fiction. It relates the experiences of a young Black woman, Dana, who is repeatedly summoned to the antebellum South to save a young white boy, Rufus,to ensure that he grows to manhood and father the daughter who will become Dana's ancestor.

These books were selected in part for what this researcher thought was their therapeutic value for this population. Bibliotherapy is the attempt to promote mental and emotional health by using reading materials to fulfill needs, relieve pressures, or help an individual in his/her development as a person.

It is important to develop not only people who can read but also people who do read. A major objective of a good reading program should be to build a lasting interest in reading. This objective can be accomplished in large part by selecting appropiate reading materials.

In order to insure reliability that each of the two instructors (A & B) was in agreement as to what the collaborative and skills methods were and how they could best be implemented in this study, the following procedures were to be adhered to:

a. Teachers A & B were self-trained using the collaborative method training tape supplied by (Palincsar and Brown, 1984). Teachers involved met to discuss this approach.

b. Teachers A & B both used the skills based method for some years; so training in this approach was not necessary. Each teacher was expected to follow the guidelines for skills based procedures as delineated in the Human Subject Statement for Skills Group (Appendix E) for the purpose of this study. Teachers involved will meet to discuss this approach.

c. Each week instructors A & B used a dictaphone to record his thoughts and concerns regarding each of the classes. These tapes were exchanged between instructors each weekend and saved and stored by the researcher.

d. All class sessions were tape recorded during weeks three, seven, and twelve of class. These tapes were exchanged, listened to, and discussed by the teachers involved.

e. Equipment needed to insure smooth communication between teachers included: a VCR, a large, powerful tape recorder, and two dictaphones. All of the above were available from the Instructional Services Department at John Jay College.

f. Each teacher observed a training videotape on how to use the collaborative method. On the last instructional day, this researcher conducted the Teacher Designed Post-Test Reading Selection (Appendix B). This was a final assessment exercise entitled, "Love and Marriage: A Historical View," with all groups. First, each class was asked to read a selection silently during class session. The researcher then collected the reading selection and handed students an answer sheet on which they answered

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

questions regarding the exam passage. After collecting these answer sheets, they were scored and the mean score for each class was determined. Second, based upon the same reading selection, the researcher posed an identical list of previously weighted questions to each class to help discern how successfully students in each group could predict, generate questions, clarify and summarize based upon the test passage. These test sessions were tape recorded and transcribed for purposes of scoring.

Data Collection

Quantitative

The following quantitative data were collected using a Student Survey (Appendix F) in addition to pre- and post-test DTLS & Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test Scores: 1) background information on the students including gender, age, ethnicity, family economic background, high school grade average, and type of secondary school diploma (Appendix G); 2) student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the following aspects of their reading coursework: a) instructional approach, b) instructional quality, c) amount of time devoted to study, d) testing and student assessment, and e) quality of reading materials; 3) student motivation level for the course; 4) amount of outside help received; 5) participation in extra-curricular activities; and 6) approximate number of hours per week devoted to course study. Data for items 1 - 6 were collected using a Student Survey (Appendix F).

Qualitative

Using two Wollensak tape recorders, each teacher's class was recorded during weeks three, seven, and twelve. These tapes were then transcribed so that they might be analyzed.

Data Analysis

Quantitative

Quantitative preliminary analysis was conducted on the background variables of the participating students. Frequencies and distributions on background variables were reported.

Research question 1 (p. 19) was tested using 2 x 2 (See Design Diagram, Appendix H) analysis of covariance, with pretest scores as the covariate, posttest scores as the dependent variable, and teacher and instructional method being the independent factors. The use of teachers as a factor controlled for teacher effects. A level of significance (criterion level) of .05 was used to test for significant differences.

Research questions 2 and 3 (p. 19) were tested separately using a discriminant analysis for the students receiving the collaborative and skills instructional method. The predictor variables included teacher, student background factors, student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with their reading coursework, motivation level for the course, amount of outside help received, participation in extra-curricular activities, and approximate number of hours per week devoted to course study.

The Teacher Designed Post-Test Reading Selection (Appendix B) was included as a supplementary analysis because its different sensibility from the other instruments used might result in insight into group variance which might otherwise have gone overlooked. Correlations were obtained between the teacher-made tests and the standardized instruments.

Qualitative

Analysis was conducted of twelve hours of classroom audiotapes. The audiotapes were listened to in their entirety. Then tapes representing the best examples of each method by each teacher, totalling four, will be selected and further analyzed. This analysis will include a description of the structure of the lesson and a description of classroom interaction. Answers to two basic questions were also sought. "Was what the researcher observed what was intended?" "Was the method more effectively executed by one teacher or the other?"

A supplementary analysis of these audiotapes focused upon dissimilarities between teachers based upon the eight remaining tapes. This analysis focused upon classroom activities and teaching techniques.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this study which must be considered in interpreting its findings. The first of these is the dual role played by the researcher who was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

also the classroom instructor. This is an inherent problem in all teacher-initiated classroom-based research. Since students knew they were going to be graded by the teacher at the end of the course, this might have affected the way they performed in the classroom.

Students may have made a special effort to give the teacher what they felt was wanted. This would apply to answers given in the course evaluations as well as the student perceptions questionnaire.

On the other hand, it is also possible that students felt more comfortable in providing data to their instructor, whom they have come to know and trust over the period of study. Therefore, perhaps they were more likely to completely and honestly reveal and discuss their ideas and feelings than if the researcher were a person with whom they were unfamiliar.

An additional consideration stemming from the dual teacher-research role is the fact that the instructor was both teaching students to use effective comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring strategies while also gathering data about students' abilities to use such strategies. For example, teacher feedback was directed at encouraging students to use efficient reading strategies and models of student responses which exhibited such strategies were pointed out to the class.

The data from this study must also be considered to be incomplete. It must be assumed that what students stated in class, in all likelihood, represented only some of the strategies used and only a portion of the thoughts which occurred to them as they read.. Such verbal data must therefore be regarded as fragmentary.

A final limitation of this inquiry is the small size of the student sample group. Because of this, results of the study cannot be generalized to other populations.

Despite these limitations, this study makes a valuable contribution towards a better understanding of the relative value of two methods of teaching four-year college developmental reading students.

Sequitur

It is difficult, if not impossible to get two individuals (teachers) to implement the same method in the same way. Therefore, a source of weakness for method studies can be found in the "truth of fit" between the prototype and its implementation.

This source of error involves the implementation of the method as originally conceived. Other teacher differences such as personal teaching techniques and classroom activities may also account for some of the dissimilarity.

The participant/observer role of the researcher also creates limitations. When the researcher is a participant in the study, questions concerning objectivity arise. How can one be sure the researcher was not partial to one group or one method? Such an occurrence could seriously compromise the research findings.

Chapter IV

Quantitative Findings

The quantitative findings are presented in three parts. Section one contains the preliminary analysis which includes distributions and frequencies of the subjects on background variables and summary data. This analysis is made for the entire sample. Section two contains data on the testing of the research questions which are analyzed using the summary data on reading test results, student characteristics data, and student perceptions on evaluation and motivation surveys. The analysis is done for two groups of 17 successful and 33 unsuccessful students on two instruments: the DTLS (Descriptive Test of Language Skills) and the SDRT (Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test). Section three contains supplemental analysis using correlation between the teacher made final assesements and reading test results for the sample.

Section I

Report On Student Background Variables

Total Sample

The fifty student participants involved in this study completed a Student Information Survey at the beginning of data collection during the spring semester of 1991. (Appendix B)

When surveyed on student age, students reported an age range from 16-47. The mean age was 21 years and nine months. The mode was 19 years, and the median was 20 years.

Twenty-nine students (58%) were female, and 21 (42%) were male. In terms of ethnicity, 22 (44%) identified themselves as Hispanic. Twenty-one (42%) reported they were Black non-Hispanic. Three (6%) reported they were White non-Hispanic, and three (6%) were self-classified as "other." One (2%) reported he/she was Italian-American.

When surveyed on language, 20 (40%) of the students indicated English to be their primary language. Seventeen (34%) identified Spanish as their first language. Five (10%) reported their primary tongue to be some language other than those named in this survey. Four (8%) identified French as their first language, and 4 (8%) reported Creole.

Table 1

Frequencies and Distributions of Students on Background Variables

(N = 50)

Variables	(n)	(%)
Sex		
Male	21	42.0
Female	29	58.0
Ethnicity		
Black	21	42.0
Hispanic	22	44.0
White	04	8.0
Other	03	6.0
First Language		
English	20	40.0
Spanish	17	34.0
French	4	8.0
Creole	4	8.0
Other	5	10.0
Income		
< $8,000	12	24.0
$8,000-$15,999	7	14.0
$16,000-$23,999	16	32.0
$24,000+	12	24.0
Nonresponse	3	6.0
High School Average		
< 70	7	14.0
71-80	30	60.0
81-90	10	20.0
91-99	1	2.0
Nonresponse	2	4.0
Diploma		
H.S.	44	88.0
G.E.D.	6	12.0

The subjects involved in this study were from different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Ethnically, students were classified as Black, Hispanic, White and other. Linguistically these students' first languages were: English, Spanish, French, Creole and other. Matters of within group identity are tricky and must be approached with caution when undertaking a research project, especially if the researcher is an outsider.

Some students who shared similar backgrounds excelled using each method while others did not. This same phenomena was also noticed among students who spoke a non-standard dialect of English. The reason for this phenomena lies with the individual subject. Some possible causes for the occurrence include: motivation, family support and/or environment, and maturity. Because the exit test was in English, those students who were less proficient in English were at a disadvantage. Students who did not speak English at home were also at a disadvantage because it usually implied that that student was less proficient.

Students from higher socio-economic backgrounds seemed to score higher on the post-test regardless of ethnic and linguistic differences. The researcher's observations seem to verify the old adage that ability, like so many other human characteristics, is spread randomly throughout the population. Of course, native ability which has been nurtured with the support that money provides enjoys a distinct advantage regardless of one's ethnic and/or linguistic background.

When surveyed on family income, 19 (38%) reported that their families earned 16,000-23,000 dollars annually. Twelve (24%) indicated that their families earned less than 8,000 dollars, and another 12 (24%) reported that their families earned more than 24,000 dollars yearly. Seven (14%) indicated that their families' annual income ranged between 8,000 and 15,999 dollars.

When surveyed on high school average, 30 (60%) reported a grade point average (g.p.a.) between 71-80. Ten (20%) indicated a g.p.a. between 81-90. Nine (18%) indicated that their average was below 70, and 1 (2%) reported a g.p.a. between 91-99.

When surveyed on type of high school diploma received, 44 (88%) reported that they received a regular high school diploma, and 6 (12%) indicated that they received General Educational Development (G.E.D.) diplomas.

For frequencies and distributions of students' background variables by class on background variables refer to Appendix M.

Section II

Research Question 1

Is One Method (Collaborative or Skills) more effective than the other?

The sample for this experiment has not passed the City University of New York's reading proficiency examination, the Descriptive Test of Language Skills (DTLS).
The DTLS is a placement test with a pass/fail cutoff established by CUNY Central. The minimal passing score on this test when this study was conducted during the spring semester of 1991 was 28. This section will be organized as follows: first, a descriptive analysis of test results and second, an analysis of covariance.

Table 2

Pre-DTLS Results at the Beginning of the Course

1-19	20-27	
31 62%	19 38%	Total 50 students

Pre-DTLS by Post-DTLS Results at the End of the Course:

	Entrance Scores	Pre-DTLS 1-19	 20-27	students	
POSTDTLS	Exit Scores 1-19	19 38%	4 8%	33	low
	20-27	6 12%	4 8%		
	28-45	6 12%	11 22%	17	high
		31	19	50	

(For the summary table on the above structural triads, please refer to Appendix L.)

A summary of the success, or lack thereof, of these two methods can be demonstrated by the number and distribution of students who eventually earn a passing score on the Post-DTLS. Approximately one-third of the sample was successful. Table 2 (Pre-DTLS by Post-DTLS Results at the End of the Course) summarizes the movement of students among groups, from Pre-DTLS to Post-DTLS.

Table 2 is a condensed version of a much lengthier crosstabs table using SPSS PC+. A score of 28 on the Post-DTLS was the minimum passing score on the form of the post-test given to all entering freshmen during the spring semester of 1991. All fifty of the students who were enrolled in this study earned less than the minimum passing score on the Pre-DTLS. For a breakdown of these scores refer to the upper-most part of Table 2.

By the end of the semester, considerable movement could be noticed among "bot" 1-19, "mid" 20-27 and "top" 28-45 groups. 31 students originally pre-tested into the group that scored 1-19 correct out of a possible 45 items. On the DTLS post-test, 6 of these students scored in the 20-27 range which was higher but still not sufficient to pass the class. An additional 6 of these students scored in the 28-45 range thereby passing the City University of New York minimum reading requirement.

On the pre-test, 19 (38%) students scored between 20-27 points on the DTLS. Among this group, on the Post-DTLS, 4 students lost ground and fell back into the bottom 1-19 group. 4 remained in the mid group and an additional 11 students scored between 28-45, thereby passing the CUNY reading requirement.

What is significant about this finding is that nearly twice as many students who pre-tested into the top portion of the low 20-27 group earned passing scores on the Post-DTLS as students who pre-tested into the lower portion of the low 1-19 group.

One way to summarize whether one method (collaborative or skills) is more effective than the other is to analyze reading test results on pre and post test scores on two instruments, the DTLS and the SDRT. Table 3 (Cell Means DTLS) which follows and Appendix N (Cell Means SDRT) summarizes these data.

Table 3 summarizes the means and standard deviations of each method and gives totals for all groups on both the DTLS and the SDRT instruments. This table was compiled using the breakdown table command on SPSS PC+. Pre and post test scores are given on each method using each instrument. Post test scores were higher for skills. However, two important points are worth noting. First, students taught using the collaborative method scored lower Pre-DTLS and pre-SDRT scores than did students taught using the skills method. Students taught using the collaborative method were lower by approximately .5 points on the DTLS, and lower by 1.03 grade levels on the SDRT. Secondly, the standard deviations on the DTLS pre and post tests are quite high for both methods. The

DTLS and SDRT standard deviations are different because the DTLS is measured in the number of correct responses while the SDRT which has lower standard deviations is scored in grade levels.

Table 3

CELL Means

Ancova - Post-DTLS - By Method - Teacher with Pre-DTLS

Total Population

25.75 (50)

Method

1	2
23.75 (28)	26.73 (22)

Teacher

A	B
27.26 (23)	23.88 (27)

	Teacher	
	A	B
Method 1	27.58 (12)	20.88 (16)
2	26.91 (11)	26.55 (11)

Table 4

Tables of Means and Standard Deviations (of DTLS and SDRT Pre and Post Testing for Collaborative & Skills Methods)

Method

Collaborative (n=28)

Pre	Post
DTLS	
16.96	23.75
(4.65)	(7.07)
SDRT	
7.05*	8.11*
(2.61)	(2.98)

Skills (n=22)

Pre	Post
DTLS	
17.50	26.73
(4.65)	(8.18)
SDRT	
8.08*	8.77*
(2.87)	(2.61)

* indicated scores in grade levels.

Ancova on SPSS PC+ was the statistical procedure used to determine whether the two methods of teaching reading were differentially effective when the pretest was controlled. The summary is presented in Table 4 (Tables of Means and Standard Deviations).

The above table using the Pre-DTLS as the covariate reveals that as a main effect, method is not significant. Therefore, it was concluded that the collaborative method is no more effective than the skills method on the DTLS.

In order to complete this analysis another Ancova procedure was also performed to test research question 1 on the SDRT. The results follow in Table 5 (Analysis of Co-Variance for DTLS).

Table 5

Analysis of Co-Variance for DTLS

Source Of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	SIG
Covariate	742.793	1	742.793	18.229	.000
Pre-DTLS					
Main Effects	105.879	2	52.939	1.299	.283
Method	72.890	1	72.890	1.789	.188
Teacher	27.754	1	27.754	.681	.414
2-way Interaction	186.465	1	186.465	4.576	.038
Method Teacher					
Explained	1035.137	4	258.784	6.351	.000
Residual	1833.683	45	40.749		
Total	2868.820	49	58.547		

Covariate Raw Regression Coefficient
Pre-DTLS .865

Multiple R Squared = .296

Table 6

Analysis of Co-Variance Table SDRT

Sources of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Signif of F
Covariates	251.666	1	251.666	101.934	.000
Pre-SDRT					
Main Effects	13.491	2	6.746	2.732	.076
Method	.704	1	.704	.285	.596
Teacher	13.001	1	13.001	5.266	.026
Explained	268.029	4	67.007	27.140	.000
Residual	111.101	45	2.469		
Total	379.130	49	7.737		

Covariate	Raw Regression Coefficient
Pre-SDRT	.824

Multiple R Squared = .699

The above table summarizes the results of the Ancova test on the SDRT using the Pre-SDRT as the covariate with method as the main effect. This test also reveals that method is not significant.

Research question 1 states, "Is one method (collaborative or skills) more effective than the other?" Based upon the two Ancova tests above in Tables 4 and 5, it can be concluded that method is not found to be significant on either the DTLS or the SDRT.

If the teacher variable is taken into consideration, the main effect of teacher is also not significant on the DTLS. However, it is the interaction between METHOD and TEACHER which proves to be significant (.038) on the DTLS. If the teacher variable is taken into consideration on the SDRT, the main effect of teacher is significant at the .026 level. However, the interaction between METHOD and TEACHER on the SDRT is not significant. It seems that method by itself is not an important factor on either the DTLS or the SDRT. However, the teacher variable though not significant on the DTLS is significant on the SDRT, and the interaction between teacher and method is significant on the DTLS.

Research Question 2

What are the perceptions of students who score high and low on each method (collaborative or skills).

Student Perceptions have two parts: Institution Related Variables, evaluation and Student Related Variables, motivation. In this section, the low and high mean values have been identified for the failing and passing groups. Using breakdown of means procedure on SPSS PC+, test means and standard deviations are included for each mean value held by students. The first part concerns course evaluation.

Data for this section were taken from the course evaluation entitled, "Student Survey," which was administered at the end of the treatment. The survey questions on this instrument took the form of a five point likert scale. The possible responses included: 1 "did not like," 2 "liked a little," 3 "liked somewhat," 4 "liked a lot," and 5 "liked extremely."

Students' perceptions of Student Related Variables were also included in the "Student Survey." These questions were also posed in the form of a five point likert scale. The scale range for the motivation variable was:

1 "not at all motivated," 2 "motivated a little bit,"
3 "motivated you somewhat," 4 "motivated a lot'"
5 "extremely motivated".

The range for other two variables, the number of hours studied per week and the number of hours spent in extracurricular activities, are not included here. For this information refer to Appendix C.

Institution Related Variables

Evaluation question one concerned the instructional approach or, more specifically, the techniques used and the way the material was approached by the instructor. The mean for the entire population was 4.220 which corresponds to "liked a lot" on the likert scale of values set up in the original questionnaire. Comparing the two methods, the mean score for the collaborative group was 4.4286. This indicates that overall the collaborative group found the instructional approach to be somewhat more to their liking than the skills group (3.9545). Comparing the perceptions of students in the pass and fail groups for each method, very little within method difference in perception seems to exist. However, the collaborative pass and fail groups rated the instructional approach higher than the skills pass and fail groups. This suggests that regardless or whether students passed or failed collaborative students liked the approach more than their skills counterparts.

Evaluation question two addresses the issue of student perceptions of instructional quality which involved the instructor's skill at delivering the lesson. The mean for the entire population was 4.4000 suggesting that the students "liked a lot" the instructional skills demonstrated by the two teachers involved in this study. Comparing the two methods, the mean for the collaborative group was 4.6786 while the mean for the skills group was 4.0455. Comparing the perceptions of students in the pass and fail groups for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

each method, among the collaborative group both students in the pass and fail groups rated eval two approximately equally high while among skill students, those passing rated the instructional quality somewhat higher than those who failed the DTLS (Descriptive Test of Language Skills). Overall, collaborative students in both the pass and fail groups rated the instructional quality higher than students in the skills group. For both methods, passing students rated the instructional quality higher than failing students though among collaborative students the differences were quite small. Students taught using the skills method who failed the DTLS rated the instructional quality lower than their counterparts who were taught using the collaborative methods.

Evaluation question three inquired as to students' perceptions concerning the number and fairness of tests. The sample population rated assessment as "liked a lot" with a mean of 4.1800. Comparing the two methods, collaborative students with a mean of 4.4286 evaluated testing somewhat higher than skills students with a mean of 3.8636. Comparing the perceptions of the pass and fail subgroup for each method, the differences were small and the findings were mixed. Among collaborative students, the fail group rated assessment somewhat lower while among the fail skills students it was rated somewhat higher. It is interesting that though students rated the fairness of tests quite high, they expressed dissatisfaction during the course of the semester about the rigid thirty minute time limit. This is one indication of how student gratification can skew student perceptions at the end of a course of study.

Evaluation question four deals with the quality of reading materials. The sample population "liked a lot" the reading materials rating it with a mean of 4.0400. Comparing the two methods, it should be noted that students in the collaborative group were somewhat more pleased than students in the skills group. One reason for this occurrence is because the collaborative group used trade book while the skills group used an exercise oriented textbook. The tradebooks sustained a high interest level for most students. Though various selections and exercises in the skills book might have been interesting, they were typically brief and exercises were to each other unrelated in terms of content. Therefore, the interest level of this skills textbook did not build as it did with the collaborative trade books.

Evaluation question five addressed the question of the availability of help. The sample population with a mean of 4.2800 "liked a lot" the availability of help for students. Comparing the two methods, collaborative students rated higher (4.4286) on this value than skills students (4.0909). Comparing the perceptions of students in the pass and fail subgroups for each method, students in the fail subgroup using the collaborative method rated the availability of help somewhat higher than students in the pass subgroup. Conversely, students in the pass group taught using the skills method rated the availability of help slightly higher then students in the fail subgroup. The collaborative method with its use of classroom discussion seems to have been perceived by students as more supportive (scaffold building). It is interesting that students in the fail collaborative subgroup rated the availability of help higher than the pass subgroup. Students in the skills fail subgroup rated the availability of help slightly lower that the pass subgroup.

Evaluation question six concerns the quality of the reading lab. The sample population "liked somewhat" the quality of the reading lab with a mean of 3.8000. Comparing the two methods, collaborative students rated the reading lab somewhat higher (3.9643) than skills students (3.5906) Comparing the perceptions of students in the pass and fail subgroup for each method, collaborative students who failed rated the lab slightly higher than passing students. Skills failing students rated the lab somewhat lower than passing students. This finding suggests that students in the failed group with both methods perceived the reading lab to be more helpful than the passing group with each method. Collaborative students in greater need of improving their reading skills rated the quality of the lab higher. Among skills students the converse was true.

Evaluation question seven addresses the issue of the pace of instruction. A mean of 4.1000 was the rating of the sample population. This mean translates to a likert value of "liked a lot" on the original questionnaire. Comparing the methods, collaborative students (4.1071) rated pace of instruction slightly higher than skills students (4.0909). Comparing the perceptions of students in the pass and fail subgroups for each method, collaborative students in the fail subgroup rated the pace of instruction slightly higher than the pass subgroup while skills students in the pass subgroup rated it slightly higher than those in the fail subgroup. This finding reveals that collaborative classes which were typically slow paced were rated slightly higher by the failed group. Perhaps these students found the pace of instruction to be more suited to them. Conversely, among skills students the pass group rated the pace of instruction slightly higher. Typically, skills classes have a faster, snappier pace due to the nature of the classroom interaction dictated by the method.

Evaluation question eight summarized the students' overall perception of the quality of the course. The sample population rated the mean to be 4.3000 or "liked a lot." Comparing the two methods, the collaborative group rated the mean 4.3571 while the skills group rated the mean as 4.2273. Comparing the perceptions of students in the pass fail subgroups for each method collaborative, failing students rated the quality slightly higher than passing students using the same method while skills, passing students rated the quality "somewhat" higher than failed skills students.

Table 7

Student Perceptions: EVALS 1-8

COLLABORATIVE			SKILLS			
FAIL (n=21)	PASS (n=7)	TOT COLL. (n=22)	FAIL (n=12)	PASS (n=10)	TOT SK. (n=22)	TOT POP. (n=50)
EVAL 1						
4.4286	4.4286	4.4286	4.0000	3.9000	3.9545	4.2200
.6761	.7868	.6901	.6030	.7379	.6530	.7083
EVAL 2						
4.6667	4.7143	4.6786	3.9167	3.8000	4.0455	4.4000
.4830	.4880	.4756	.7930	.7888	.7854	.6999
EVAL 3						
4.3810	4.5714	4.4286	3.9167	3.8000	3.8636	4.1800
.7400	.5345	.6901	.6686	.7888	.7102	.7475
EVAL 4						
4.1905	4.4286	4.2500	3.6667	3.9000	3.7727	4.0400
.9808	.5345	.8872	.7785	.9944	.8691	.9026
EVAL 5						
4.4762	4.2857	4.4286	4.0833	4.1000	4.0909	4.2800
.7496	.7559	.7418	.2887	.7379	.5264	.6713
EVAL 6						
4.0000	3.8571	3.9643	3.3333	3.9000	3.5909	3.8000
1.0954	.8997	1.0357	1.0731	.7379	.9591	1.0120
EVAL 7						
4.1429	4.0000	4.1071	4.0833	4.1000	4.0909	4.1000
.7270	1.4142	.9165	.7930	.5676	.6838	.8144
EVAL 8						
4.3810	4.2857	4.3571	4.0833	4.4000	4.2273	4.3000
.6690	.7559	.6785	.6686	.6990	.6853	.6776

Student Related Variables

Hours Studied

Subjects in this study reported that they spent approximately 3-4 hours per week preparing their lessons. Collaborative students reported studying slightly more hours than skills students. Students in the fail subgroup reported having studied more hours than students in the pass subgroup. Students in the fail subgroup are likely to have studied more hours because their reading skill level required it.

Level of Motivation

On average, students reported that they were "motivated somewhat." Collaborative students reported that they were somewhat more motivated than skills students. Students in the pass group with each method reported that they were more motivated than students in the fail group. Passing students reported that they were more highly motivated regardless of method though they reported having studied less than failed students. Collaborative students might have been more highly motivated in part because of the method used.

Extracurricular Hours

The sample population on average reported that they participated in extracurricular activities approximately 1-2 hours per week. Collaborative students reported that they were somewhat more active than skills students. Passing students in the collaborative group reported that they participated in extracurricular activities more than failed students. However, failed students in the skills group reported that they participated in these activities more.

Table 8

Student Perceptions: Self-Reported Motivation

	COLLABORATIVE			SKILLS			
	FAIL (n=21)	PASS (n=7)	TOT COL (n=28)	FAIL (n=12)	PASS (n=10)	TOT SK (n=22)	TOT POP (n=50)
HRSSTUD	3.5714	2.5714	3.3214	3.2500	2.8000	3.0455	3.0455
	1.2873	.9759	1.2781	1.5448	1.1353	1.3620	1.3093
MOTIVAT	3.8095	4.0000	3.8571	3.1667	3.4000	3.2727	3.6000
	.8729	1.0000	.8909	1.0320	1.1738	1.0320	.9897
EXTRCUR	2.0952	3.1429	2.3571	2.1667	1.6000	1.9091	2.1600
	1.5134	2.1157	1.7043	1.4035	1.0750	1.2690	1.5301

Research Question 3

What are the characteristics of students who score high and low on each method (collaborative or skills)?

Table 9

Frequencies and Distributions of Students by Class on Background Variables

(n=50)

Variables	Class 1 n=11	Class 2 n=16	Class 3 n=12	Class 4 n=11
Age				
range	16-30	17-47	20-35	18-27
mean	20	21	20	21
Sex				
male	6	6	4	5
female	5	10	8	6
Ethnicity				
Black	4	9	4	4
Hispanic	5	6	6	5
White	1	0	1	2
Other	1	1	1	0
First Language				
English	5	6	4	5
Spanish	3	5	5	4
French	0	2	1	1
Creole	3	0	0	0
Other	0	3	2	1
Income				
<$8,000	1	6	2	3
$8,001-15,999	2	2*	2	1
$16,000-23,999	5*	6	4*	4*
$24,000+	3	2	4	3
High School Average				
<70	3	3	1	2
71-80	5	10	10	5
81-90	3	2	1	4
91-99	0	1	0	0
Diploma				
High School	11	14	10	9
G.E.D.	0	2	2	2

Table 10

Frequencies and Distributions of Students on Background Student Characteristics by Method and Low/High

(n=50)

Variables	L. Coll. (n=21)	L. Sk. (n=12)	H.Coll. (n=7)	H.Sk. (n=10)
Sex				
male	14	6	4	5
female	7	6	3	5
Ethnicity				
Black	9	4	4	4
Hispanic	9	6	3	4
White	1	2	0	1
Other	2	0	0	1
First Language				
English	6	4	4	6
Spanish	8	4	2	3
French	2	1	1	0
Creole	0	3	0	1
Other	5	0	0	0
Income				
<$8,000	8	4	1	0
$8,001-15,999	3	3	0	0
$16,000-23,999	8	4	2	5
$24,000+	2	1	4	5
High School Average				
<70	3	4	1	1
71-80	14	3	6	7
81-90	3	5	0	2
91-99	1	0	0	0
Diploma				
High School	19	12	5	8
G.E.D.	2	0	2	2
Age	17-35	16-27	20-47	18-30

Section III

The final teacher-made written assessment was designed and administered by the teacher on the last day of class. Students were given a timed reading passage which was then collected and a written test of the passage was administered to each student. This was followed by a teacher-made oral assessment which was administered on a class-wide basis.

Table 11 (Correlation between Standardized and Teacher-Made Measures) which follows is designed to facilitate an investigation of the relationship between the two standardized measures (DTLS and SDRT) and the teacher-made measures. Their correlations have been computed below.

The Final Teacher Made Written Assessment (FTMWA) and the Final Teacher Made Oral Assessment (FTMOA) were administered to students at the end of the treatment. Using a correlation procedure on SPSS PC+, the following findings were made.

The Post-DTLS correlated with the FTMWA (r=.5448) sig.= .001. The Post-DTLS also correlated with the FTMOA (r=.3718) sig.=.01. The Post-SDRT correlated with the FTMWA (r=.5088) sig.=.001. However, the Post-SDRT does not correlate at a significant level with FTMOA (r=.2835).

It is worth noting that the FTMWA and FTMOA were administered differently which perhaps affects their correlation with the two post-tests. The FTMWA was administered on an individual basis while the FTMOA was administered on a class-wide basis. Therefore, the FTMOA score was the result of a group effort (less reliable) rather

Table 11

Table of Correlation between Standardized and Teacher-Made Measures

Correlations: Total Population (N=50)

	Post-DTLS	Post-SDRT	FTMWA	FTMOA
Post-DTLS	1.00			
Post-SDRT	.7718**	1.00		
FTMWA	.5448**	.5088**	1.00	
FTMOA	.3718*	.2836	.0815	1.00

One-tailed significance: * = .01
** = .001

than an individual one. It is also interesting that the FTMOA does not correlate significantly with the Post-SDRT. Still, overall it is the more reliable of the two post-test instruments. Literature supplied by the publisher states that the DTLS Reading Comprehension Test has a reliability of .89. Buros Tests and Measurement states that the SDRT Comprehension Test has a reliability of .96. The reported reliability of each of the above tests is quite high. However, structural differences between the two tests makes the DTLS the less reliable of the two. Several of the DTLS Comprehension Tests repeat the same reading passages and multiple choice test items included in other equivalent versions of this tests. This fact makes this test the less reliable of the two instruments.

The final teacher-made assessments were relatively reliable instruments. The standardized reading instruments and the teacher-made tests were moderately correlated. The teacher-made tests were originally included in this study to allow for the possibility that the standardized instruments would not be sensitive enough to detect the skills students are likely to develop using a discussion technique. This concern did not prove to be warranted. The results revealed that the correlation between the standardized tests and the teacher-made tests are actually quite high. These findings suggest that for the most part, the finding of the standardized tests are corroborated in the findings of the teacher-made instruments.

CHAPTER V

QUALITATIVE FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to help account for some of the gains among classes. In this chapter, the focus is upon teaching method and teaching practices. An ancova procedure was run on both the Post-DTLS and Post-SDRT scores. Both analyses revealed that Teacher A's classes scored higher than did Teacher B's classes on each measure with both methods, when the covariate (pretest) scores were taken into consideration. (See Table 3, Ancova Post-DTLS Teacher by Method and Appendix N, Ancova, Cell Means, Post-SDRT Teacher by Method).

This chapter is presented to answer two basic questions. The first question asks for each method, "Was what the researcher observed what was originally intended?" The second question asks for each method, "Was the method more effectively executed by one teacher or the other?"

Twelve hours of classroom discourse was recorded using audiotapes. Two of these four classes had a skills emphasis, and two had a collaborative emphasis. One class using each method was instructed by one of two teachers during the spring semester of 1991.

This analysis uses selective observation as the research technique. This technique involves "the selection of cases that are strong exemplars of patterns and processes that the context has yielded to the researcher (Grannis, 1989)."

The principle interactional analysis paradigm is largely a linguistic measure designed by this researcher. The major form that makes up this paradigm is the structure of the lesson. This chapter is organized to address each Teacher (A and B), each method (collaborative 1 and teacher-led skills 2), respectively, and each phase of the lesson (opening, instructional and closing). It identifies the week during the fifteen week semester in which the data was collected (either week three, seven, or twelve).

For the purpose of this study, the term "best" implies an approximate match between a method (collaborative or skills) as implemented and the model type as defined in this study.

Objective Procedures

Analysis of four hours of audiotapes of classroom interaction was based upon the structure of the lesson following the work of Mehan. These tapes were transcribed and then analyzed using Mehan's paradigm. Mehan analyzed three lesson phases, the opening, instructional and closing phases. In this study, the researcher approached the data objectively to identify patterns or trends for each teacher.

The Supplemental Analysis was approached differently. The audiotapes were listened to repeatedly by the researcher for patterns or themes which characterized each teacher and only those portions of dialogue which identified a particular pattern or theme were transcribed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Again, it was necessary for the researcher to step outside of himself in the role of observer to accomplish this.

Conducting The Lesson

Bellack, et al. (1966) considered classroom activities to constitute a "game" whose rules were well understood by classroom participants but not often stated. They considered the most important aspects of that game to be concerned with language; therefore, they confined their analysis to the study of units of verbal interaction. In general, these units are referred to as "moves", which consist of one or more sentences uttered by a given speaker that have a common content and purpose. In general, the Bellack group classified all moves into one of four basic types. Structuring moves set the stage; soliciting moves are designed to elicit a response from others; responding moves occur only as a function of solicitation and are stimulated by them, and reacting moves comment upon other moves.

Mehan (1979), extends Bellack et al's work (1966) with regard to elicitations to identify four different types. They are: choice, a yes or no response; product, a factual answer; process, an opinion or interpretation; and metaprocess, a rule or procedure through which the answer was derived. Each of these initiation acts is followed by a specific type of response. Elicitations are initiation acts. Determining the type of elicitation is sometimes a matter of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

debate. However, when it is quite clear which type of elicitation is initiated, certain types appear more likely to evoke a certain pattern of response. For example, a choice or product elicitation is likely to result in an initiation-response-evaluation (I-R-E) type sequence. However, a process or metaprocess type elicitation is more likely to result in some variation on the I-R-E pattern. Therefore, the type of elicitation and the method are related issues.

It is important to recognize the I-R-E pattern in the classes of both teachers A and B. Both teachers use this pattern to teach their class using the novel, Down These Mean Streets by Piri Thomas, demonstrated in the following:

Teacher B:	What's a cabron?
Student 1:	A cabron is a term of insult to a male.
Teacher B:	Yeah. But, ah can you tell me what this term means?
Student 2:	It's a-a married man who allows his wife to sleep with other men. (class chuckles)
Teacher B:	That's correct.

Teacher B initiates with a product elicitation in this instance. A product elicitation asks respondents to provide a factual response such as a name, a place or a date. Student 1 gives a very general answer. Then Teacher B employs a strategy of prompting for a more detailed answer. Student 2 responds with the more complete and appropriate answer. This teacher's questions and comments serve as frame for each student response. The final statement made by Teacher B is evaluative in nature. This sequence is not the typical three-part instructional sequence. It is a somewhat extended sequence of interaction. Nonetheless, the sense of control and very tight structure are evident.

Teacher A uses a similar I-R-E pattern with his class in the following interaction.

> Teacher A: Student 1, Describe Piri's relationship with his father.
>
> Student 1: Piri wasn't close to his father. He [Piri] felt that somehow his father treated him different from his brothers and sisters. Piri wanted nothing more than his father's love. Piri felt his father might be treating him [Piri] like he [Piri's father] didn't care about him [Piri].
>
> Teacher A: Why did Piri feel he was treated differently?
>
> Student 4: For one of two reasons, either because Piri was the darkest [in skin color) or because he was the oldest.
>
> Teacher A: Yeah, that's a good answer. You're right on target.

Teacher A begins with another product elicitation. But this discussion develops into a borderline process elicitation. A process elicitation asks respondents to provide their opinions or interpretations. The response of Student 1 begins with a factual response but gradually evolves into interpretation. Teacher A's final comment is also evaluative in nature. This constitutes a typical three-part instructional sequence. The sense of control and the central role of teacher approval is reflected in this transcription as well.

The I-R-E pattern is a useful device because it allows teachers to control the pace at which students can get through a particular task or a whole curriculum. This pattern centers classroom authority in the teachers' role. The origin of this model finds its roots in the socratic and catechism methods. The Socratic or dialectical method is a precursor of the skills method. Typically at the onset of dialogue a question is raised by Socrates. Then Socrates (the teacher) presses for a response to his query. The dialectical method followed the I-R-E pattern. The catechism method took the form of a manual of instruction arranged in the form of questions and answers. The beginnings of the Christian catechism is medieval. It was in the sixteenth century that the catechism established itself as a genre of Christian pedagogical literature. In a country in which the school system was conceived of as the "Model of Society" (Grannis, 1967) the catechism method was adapted for education using the industry model with its emphasis upon efficiency and productivity characterized by the assembly line. The I-R-E instructional sequence was doubtless an important means to an end. Within the realm of possible expected outcomes, the range of responses to these solicitations was varied.

For both teachers applying the teacher-led skills method, the sequence of the interaction has the same basic structure. The teachers began the sequence by posing a question and selecting a student to respond to the question he/she poses. Then the nominated student typically responds, and the teacher comments on or evaluates the student's response. This three part sequence has been identified as the most frequent pattern of classroom discourse. And it is useful because it allows the teacher to control both the development of the topic and who gets an opportunity to talk. This finding will be elaborated upon in what follows. This sequence, while present in both the teacher-led skills and the collaborative methods, is much more prevalent in the teacher-led skills.

Structure of Skills Lessons

Students in skills classes for both Teachers A and B in week seven were assigned to read selections found in the second half of the class text, The Reading Skills Handbook. The selection for Teacher A's class was entitled, "Six Keys to Quicker Learning." Time was then allowed for students to write their answers to the exercises which immediately follow the passage. The teacher then led the students through a review of the skills exercises.

It should be noted that the portion of the lesson that this researcher has included below constitutes the first phase, the opening of Teacher A's class, with both its directive and informative sequence. The class was informed that they would be allowed ten minutes to read this passage and five minutes to answer the ten multiple choice questions which followed the selection. The directive sequence focuses the students' attention upon the task which the teacher has chosen. And the informative sequence identifies the parameters or instructions for carrying out the directive. For this selection, the class was directed by the teacher to read silently pages 269-273. The following interaction occurred as students reviewed the exercises.

Instructional Phase Of The Skills Lesson Teacher A

Teacher A: The main idea of this selection is...(Teacher A points to the student to respond).

Student 1: The correct answer is A.

Teacher A: Why do you think A is the correct answer? Explain your reason for choosing A.

Student 1: I think the answer is A because I believe it's true that either you are born with a good memory or you aren't.

Teacher A: This might sound harsh Student 1, but frankly, the author is really not concerned with what you believe. The stem of the question states, "The main idea of this selection is..." It does not ask what you believe does it?
does it?

Student 1: No, it doesn't.

Teacher A: Then perhaps you would like to revise your response.

Teacher A opens with a product initiation which is followed by a metaprocess initiation. The metaprocess initiation calls upon the student to provide the rule or procedure by which the student has arrived at an answer. Teacher A is concurrently offering guidance to students concerning testwiseness and test taking strategies. The above interaction records the first topical set in the instructional phase of Teacher A's skills lesson. The instructional format follows closely the questions and the limited universe (four multiple choice options) offered for each of the ten questions. The lesson seems to focus on how students can learn to wend their way through pitfalls when confronted with a multiple choice task. As the teacher explores with the student his/her rationale for choosing one response over others, the teacher focuses the students' attention upon techniques for answering multiple choice questions. This is a valuable skill in an educational system that evaluates student ability and achievement largely on the basis of their success with negotiating this type of test item.

Closing Phase Skills Lesson Teacher A

> Next class I want you to read chapter 6 entitled, "Reading for Information." Complete all exercises and prepare to answer questions during class next week.

The above closing is simple and traditional. It includes the directive and informative aspects typically found in a closing.

Opening Phase Of The Skills Lesson Teacher B

The teacher-led skills class (week 7) with its focus offers guided practice in how to choose the best main idea, inference, definition of a term, fact-finding statement, etc. In this instance, students were required to generate or create their own choices. The demands of this task were of a higher order. The opening of the lesson gave the directive, for students to read a passage found in the second half of the text, *Reading Skills Handbook*, pages 386-389.

No time limit was stated. Teacher B informed students that they should work on their concentration skills. Each time students found their thoughts wandering, they were informed to make a mark at the top of their answer sheets then try to refocus and continue reading until the task was completed.

Instructional Phase Of The Skills Lesson Teacher B

Teacher B: How many of you read this selection and answered the ten multiple choice questions? (Show of hands). Okay, let's look at the exercise questions. State in your own words the main ideas of this selection Student 1.

Student 1: At different times of the day, you should listen to your body clock.

Teacher B: Could you state your answer more clearly?

Student 1: Uhh, at different times of the day, we are better at doing different kinds of things.

Teacher B: Yeah, now that's a good, clear statement of the main idea. Do you understand why your first statement was unclear Student 1?

Student 1: Ah, after I think about it I can see why, things don't always come out clear for me the first time.

Teacher B: Well, we all need to be in the habit of editing ourselves in both our oral and written expression. Now, the first question asks, "The main idea of this selection is stated most clearly in:

a. the final sentence of the first paragraph

b. the opening sentence of the third paragraph

c. the opening sentence of the fifth paragraph

d. the final sentence of the next to last paragraph."

Student 2, which of those I just read would you say represented the best statement of the main idea of this selection.

Student 2: (still searching through the different sentences) I think the best answer is B, the opening sentence of the third paragraph.

Teacher B: Please read that sentence for the class.

Student 2: "All living organisms, from mollusks to men and women, exhibit biological rhythms."

Teacher B: Good selection Student 2.

This is an example of an extended sequence of interaction. Teacher B has his students work toward a clear statement of the main idea on their own with guidance. Then Teacher B encourages students to understand why one of his/her statements is better than the other. This is a metaprocess initiation. Teacher B ends this interaction with a positive evaluation.

Teacher B emphasizes concentration in reading while Teacher A emphasizes reading rate. Both of these are important to reading comprehension. But Teacher A assumed student ability to concentrate with his espoused emphasis upon rate while Teacher B assumes that if students could concentrate appropriate speed would naturally follow.

Teacher B encouraged students to evaluate their own performance. This is an interesting variation on the I-R-E sequence. For Teacher B the evaluation, in the above transcript, was student self-evaluation supplemented as needed with additional comments from the teacher.

There was a probing quality about the skills class transcriptions for Teacher A. This seems to have been achieved through the teacher's ceaseless quizzing to determine the students' rationale for choosing one option over others.

For both teachers using the skills method, turn taking followed the usual lesson sequence. The teacher regained the floor after every student's turn. This is a pattern to which students have become very accustomed over the years. One positive aspect of this pattern is that very little if any class time need be spent on procedural matters. On the other hand, the negative aspect is that students are so familiar with this procedure that they complain of boredom though they do not pinpoint its source as procedural. The students in both teacher-led skills classes initially complained of boredom. Teacher B took steps to redress student grievances by incorporating articles from newspapers and magazines, and modifying the strict skills method by incorporating some discussion of the reading selections. Teacher A was more concerned with adhering to concentration on one skill at a time as originally conceived because he was undertaking this research project. Teacher A would not modify the method to be implemented in this study as originally proposed.

The following transcription presents the closing phase of Teacher B's skills lesson.

Closing Phase Skills Lesson Teacher B

Teacher B: Today, we have discussed and practiced identifying the main idea. We have demonstrated this skill using a number of main idea exercises. The main idea is a statement in sentence form which gives the stated or implied major topic of a passage and the specific way in which the passage is limited in content. The main idea is not necessarily always expressed in the first sentence in a paragraph. In fact, it may be any sentence in a paragraph. For your home assignment this weekend, I would like for you to read pages 138-159 in The Reading Skills Handbook. This assignment will first explain to you in some detail what is meant by a stated and an unstated main idea. Please complete all the exercises.

The closing phase for Teacher B's class was in the form of a teacher soliloquy. The closing of Teacher B's class had an informative and a directive component. In the informative component, Teacher B stated what the main idea was. It also laid the groundwork for the home assignment in the directive component. The home assignment focused upon unstated main ideas. These skills present a more challenging aspect of the main idea lesson.

Lastly, this researcher poses two questions, "Was what this researcher observed what he originally intended?" Teacher A adhered more closely to the skills method as proposed for this study. Teacher B modified the skills method to include some journal writing and discussion of the content of articles. "Was the method more effectively executed for one teacher or the other?" Both teachers' skills classes' scores were very close on the Post-DTLS though Teacher B somewhat modified the method with additional activities and strategies. Student complaints in Teacher B's class stopped as the result of these modifications. For Teacher A, students' seemed to acquiesce to the inevitable. Post-DTLS test scores for this group were only slightly higher than Teacher B's class when adjusted for Pre-DTLS test scores. Teacher A executed the skills method in keeping with the original intention of this researcher. On the Post-SDRT, Teacher A's class earned decidedly higher scores than Teacher B's class. (See Table 3 and Appendix N) Teacher accounts for 27.0% of the variance on the Post-DTLS, and 69.8% on the Post-SDRT.

Structure Of Collaborative Lessons

For both classes using the collaborative method, the structure of class lessons is similar. The teacher opened the lesson with a directive which focused upon the reading task, and informed the student as to his (the teacher's) expectations. The teacher then asked a question and solicited student responses. The pattern of interaction was much less rigid for the collaborative than for the skills classes. Classroom communication opened-up. The three part sequence which is a mark of the skills method can be identified but only as one type of interactional pattern among others.

Opening Phase Of The Collaborative Lesson Teacher A

This is a soliloquy (week 3) given by Teacher A in opening a collaborative lesson. It is both directive and informative.

Teacher A: Please take the next 13 minutes to read *Kindred* pages 19-29. You have 13 minutes to complete the reading of this selection. Do you have any questions? If there are none you may begin now.

[Period of Silence.]

(It should be noted that Teacher A's students have been timed in their reading all semester.) Since this is a transcription from a tape of the third week of class, the class at this point in time is allowed 13 minutes. (The reading time is decreased by one-half minute per week.)

Instructional Phase Of Collaborative Lesson Teacher A

The material under study in this phase followed from the opening phase cited above. Topical Set 1 presents the time mystery first presented in the beginning of this novel.

Topical Set 1

(Student 7 volunteers her feelings about Rufus.)

Teacher A: Your time is up. In general terms I agree with you Student 7. Can someone go into a little more detail about Rufus?

Student 6: When Dana arrives, she confronts a little red-headed white boy. I forgot his name.

Student 7: Rufus.

Student 6: Yeah, Rufus. Dana realizes that he (Rufus) is probably the same little boy she saved from drowning in the river as a baby on her first trip.

Student 9: But she (Dana) also wonders how he (Rufus) could have grown-up so fast. On Dana's second trip, Rufus was about ten years old though only a few hours had passed since Dana's first trip when Rufus was only a baby.

Student 10: I didn't understand that either.

This is an extended interaction which does not follow the traditional pattern. This is an example of a metaprocess elicitation. It also serves as an example of a reflexive tying structure. Reflex tying structures bring together interactional sequences that are wide ranging and not limited to adjacently occurring utterances. The above transcription requires the student to analyze all of his/her reading of the novel to date, to pull together the salient facts in order to make an intelligent response.

The above excerpt is the first topical set for this interaction. It establishes the problem or mystery which is to be solved in a series of three topically related sets. The mystery is how does the reader account for the time differences between the past and the future in the novel Kindred? This question was raised by a student indirectly. Then it is explored by fellow students in public cross-discussion. Topical Set 2 which follows begins with a student offering a solution to this mystery based upon the meaning he constructed from the text.

Topical Set 2

Student 11: Well, I think they were in some kind of a time warp like on Star Trek.

Teacher A: Do you have any evidence that your time warp theory is correct Student 11?

Student 11: Yeah, I think the author did say something about it.

Teacher A: Ah, can anyone else corroborate upon Student

11's recall of this detail. (Pause)

Student 12: On page 26 of the text, the author discusses the time difference.

Teacher A: Yes, let's pause a minute and reread the passage on page 26.

[Silence]

Student 11: Yeah, I knew I remembered reading that somewhere.

Student 13: It is through Dana's conversation with Rufus that Dana is given just enough information to figure out just what is happening to Dana. That's just what Student 7 told us earlier in her summary.

This is an extended interaction. Teacher A encourages the students to engage in close textual analysis.

Topical Set 3 begins with a student offering a possible solution to this mystery. The teacher encourages students to probe to seek evidence which could either support or reject Student 11's theory. Students search the text and find support for a time warp type theory.

Topical Set 3

Teacher A: What is happening to Dana?

Student 3: Well, she is being transported across time and space from her home in Los Angeles in 1976 to the South during slavery times. And when she is transported she learns that just a few hours in Los Angeles time equals years in the time of the antebellum South.

Teacher A: Yes and doesn't that account for what Student 11 referred to as a time warp?

Teacher A opens the lesson with a three-part instructional sequence. Teacher A's final statement is less evaluative than designed to bring the topical sets to a close.

Topical set #3 above fleshes-out the time warp theory with an example of how it is operationalized in the novel. It serves as an example of the theory at work in the novel. The following closing phase of Teacher A's collaborative class is quite important because Student 12 presents a problem that several students experienced.

Closing Phase Collaborative Lesson Teacher A

Student 12: I really don't like this book. It's confusing with all this moving back and forth. Sometimes, I can't tell where she (Dana) is (whether she is in the past or in the future). It's just hard to follow.

Teacher A: (Pointing to Student 11) How do you cope with this problem?

Student 11: I just pay close attention to the people Dana is talking to. That always clues me into which time period she's living in.

Teacher A: That's a good strategy Student 11. Okay, we're out of time. For your home assignment tonight, I would like you to begin a genealogical chart of Dana's ancestors. That should help you get these characters into perspective.

The above closing phase to Teacher A's class is both informative and directive. The metaprocess elicitation above was initiated by Student 12's assessment of the novel. Teacher A solicits a suggestion from another student as to how to best respond to Student 12's provocative question. Student 11's strategy for organizing the temporal shifts in this novel is a useful device for the problem expressed by Student 12. As a follow-up, Teacher A assigned homework which would help clarify Student 12's confusion concerning the temporal shifts in the novel under consideration.

Opening Phase Of The Collaborative Lesson Teacher B

Teacher B: Chapter 18, page 182 entitled, "Barroom Sociology" in the novel, Down These Mean Streets is one of the most interesting episodes in this book. Today (week 7), you will practice on your concentration. Therefore, while reading the assigned text, I would like you (the students) to keep track of the number of times your thoughts wander from the reading. You are to do this by making a mark at the top of the page every time your thoughts stray. At the end of this practice, you may take a count. Let's have silence please.

Silence.

Does anyone need additional time. If not, let's begin our discussion.

Teacher B's opening phase above like that of Teacher A, consists of both a directive and an informative statement.

Instructional Phase Of Collaborative Lesson Teacher B

Topical Set 1

Teacher B: Who were the principle characters in the assigned selection?

Student 1: Brew, Piri and Gerald.

Teacher B: Characterize Gerald's personality.

Student 2: Gerald is kinda snobbish. He feels he is better than other people. He was a writer. Uhh. He was from Pennsylvania. He was not sure about his identity.

Student 7: Gerald was an "octoroon." He and Brew did not like each other. He (Gerald) did not want to be Black.

This is not a typical three-part sequence. Teacher B begins with a process elicitation. Student 2 and Student 7 engage briefly in discussion.

This is a product/process elicitation. It elicits facts, and follow-up questions require interpretation. It is also worth noting that the teacher does not have the last word.

Topical Set 2

Teacher B: Clarify what is meant by this quote: "He was a Negro trying to make Puerto Rican, and I was a Puerto Rican trying to be Black."

Student 3: It meant that both Piri and Gerald confronted similar situations only in reverse. Gerald was in fact Black but identified with Puerto Rican, and Piri was a Puerto Rican but identified with Black.

This is a process elicitation. Teacher B is asking for respondents' interpretation of the text. It is worth noting that a student has the last word in this interaction as well.

Topical Set 3

Teacher B: Can you infer from the text how many Blacks in Norfolk, Va. might have felt towards Gerald?

Student 4: They probably felt he was stuck-up.

Student 5: He thinks he's better than other Blacks. He probably didn't have many Black friends there.

Student 6: And if most Whites at that time found out that Gerald was Black, they probably wouldn't like him either. So, I kinda feel sorry for his situation. He must be pretty lonely.

Student 7: I don't feel sorry for him because he put himself in that situation. Gerald chooses not to identify himself as Black, so he deserves what he gets. He refers to Black people as "they."

Teacher B: What was the topic of Gerald's study in the

South? Doesn't his topic suggest that he is in fact interested in Black people?

Student 4: He is studying the "Richness of Black Folk's Poverty." He is studying the warmth and harmony of Southern Blacks.

Student 8: To me Gerald is problematic because he is a Northern Black studying Southern Blacks; he does not identify himself as Black yet he chooses to study Blacks; why is he interested in Blacks anyway? I don't trust him.

Teacher B: Why do Brew and Gerald dislike each other so much?

Student 9: Brew is a serious Black brother. He has a strong sense of Black pride. He is not willing to accept Gerald as a self-appointed Black man.

Student 5: Gerald is from a middle-class family of a Northern city, Philly. He seems to study Blacks as a curiosity. He has the wrong attitude.

The first teacher question is an example of a process elicitation. The second teacher question is an example of a product elicitation followed immediately by a process elicitation. The third teacher question is also a process elicitation. This interaction approaches public-cross discussion. Students comment upon the remarks of other students.

Teacher B initiates the reading lesson with the standard opening which Mehan identified. Consistent with Mehan's lesson structure concept, the opening consists of a directive and an informative aspect. The directive indicates the portion of text to be the subject of the day's lesson, and the informative indicates the particular spin or focus intended for the material for the day. For example, in this transcription, the teacher has identified concentration practice to be the focus for the day's reading exercise.

This transcription reveals that Teacher B has tighter control over the discussion than did Teacher A. Teacher B operationalizes the collaborative method adhering very closely to the four reading strategies used with this method (questioning, summarizing, clarifying, and predicting). The teacher initiates the class' discussion of each strategy. Each topical set represents the class' interaction around one strategy. The first set deals with a type of summary. The second set works with clarification. The third set practices inference making skills. This structured discussion makes up what Mehan refers to as the instructional portion of this class.

The above transcription is very provocative dialogue. Issues of within-group-identity are tricky. It is apparent to this researcher that the students read the assignment, and that they hold strong opinions or reactions. They seem to have tested the characters against the values of the "real" world as they have experienced it, and their evaluations of those characters evoke strong reaction. This type of reading activity communicates the true value of reading to students.

What this researcher observed in those classes using the collaborative method was close to what was intended. The collaborative method as conducted by Teacher B in the execution of the four strategies was closer to the original vision. It should be noted that though Teacher A had more experience with this method, Teacher B was more precise and deliberate with these strategies. However, because Teacher A had more experience with this method, he accomplished public-cross discussion in his classes with good frequency. The collaborative method resulted in higher scores for Teacher A as evidenced by pre-post-test results.

In summary, it should be noted that Teacher A adheres to the intended lesson structure for skills classes and had more success with the skills method when adjusted post test scores on both the DTLS and SDRT are taken into consideration. On the other hand, Teacher B adhered more closely to the intended lesson structure for collaborative classes; nevertheless, Teacher A had more success with the collaborative method as witnessed by adjusted post test scores.

Supplemental Analysis

The previous analysis of the four best taped examples of each method (collaborative and skills) did not go far enough to reveal teacher differences. The best transcriptions of each teacher with each method did not unveil enough salient differences. Therefore, this researcher identified several areas of dissimilarity between teachers based upon a close listening to the remaining (eight) tapes. The following analysis is organized around two topics: first, classroom activities; and, second, teaching technique.

Classroom Activities

Vocabulary Development

An important unit in the curricula of both Teacher A and Teacher B was vocabulary development. Each teacher handled this unit differently.

Teacher B Collaborative Skills Vocabulary Development

Teacher B substituted other materials for the assigned text, *The Reading Skills Handbook*, until after the first two weeks of class and chose to use vocabulary materials of his own design to instruct the vocabulary development unit of his classes. Both Teacher B's collaborative and skills classes were taught using the same materials and curriculum. For Teacher B, this unit involved concentrated work in vocabulary development with intensive practice using a dictionary and a thesaurus. Teacher B's vocabulary development unit consisted of four newspaper articles with challenging vocabularies.

One of these articles was entitled, "Two Live Crew Trial, Cultures Fail to Clash" from the New York Times.

Teacher B: Class, I am distributing to you an article clipped from this weekend's Times. It is about a topic which is close to one of my personal interests because as most of you know, I am a musician by avocation. I will allow you time to read this article. I hope you enjoy it as much as I did.

[silence.]

I asked you last week to bring your dictionaries to class. And I notice that most of you have done so. Now, I want you to underline all the terms that you do not understand in this article.

Now let's make a list of these terms. You tell me the words, and I'll write them on the blackboard.

Student 1: statute.

Student 2: obscenity.

Student 3: pornography.

Student 4: censure.

Student 5: ban.

Student 6: provocative.

Teacher B: I would like you to work in small groups to discuss each word in its context. First, find the word in its context, then see if you and the members of your group can figure out the meaning of the word from the contextual clues. Then check your hunches by looking the word up in the dictionary and determining which group member comes closest to the appropriate contextual meaning of the word.

[Teacher B moves from group to group.]

Group discussions ensued among the 4 or 5 members of each group around each of these terms.

Teacher A Collaborative/Skills Vocabulary Development

The first three chapters which constitute unit one of The Reading Skills Handbook were not used by Teacher B. The titles of these three chapters were chapter one, "Building a Strong Vocabulary"; chapter two, "Recognizing Word Meaning"; and, chapter three, "Using a Dictionary". In contrast, the skills class taught by Teacher A followed the curriculum and sequence of the text, including the above named chapters. Part one of the text dealt with various reading skills and follow-up questions. Part two, offered practice with these reading skills using essay length reading selections and follow-up or tag questions.

Vocabulary development in Teacher A's collaborative class was implemented as was originally proposed in this study. See Appendix E. The study of vocabulary in context was the main means of vocabulary instruction used with the collaborative method. Each student had a dictionary and was encouraged to look up all unfamiliar terms encountered in their reading. Discussion of these terms comprised a daily component of this course.

Teacher A: In your reading last night, did you come across any troublesome terms? If so, what were they?

Student 1: miasma.

Student 2: ague.

Student 3: coffle.

Student 4: keloids.

Teacher A: What is a miasma Student 1? Can you locate the sentence in the text which uses this term.

Student 3: It's on page 204 "miasma".

Teacher A: Please read it (that sentence) Student 3.

Student 3: _____ "Doc says it's something in the air that spreads ague -something off bad water and garbage. A miasma he called it."

Student 1: It is a poisonous atmosphere thought to rise from a swamp and cause disease.

Teacher A: Good, can you use this word in a sentence Student 2?

Student 2: Let's see...If steps aren't taken to get the environment straight, the earth's atmosphere could become a miasma.

Teacher A: Nice sentence Student 2.

The above dialogue follows the I-R-E (Initiation-Response-Evaluation) format. It is, therefore, very teacher centered.

Classroom Activities

Journal Writing Activity - Skills and Collaborative

Teacher B used journal writing for both his skills and collaborative classes. Teacher A did not implement this activity. Teacher B had students keep reading journals. These journals provided an outlet for students to express themselves and to keep a record of what they read on a weekly basis. The journals recorded what the students were thinking and/or feeling about what they read. Teacher B collected these journals three times during the semester. They were not graded, but teacher comments were written on each.

Teacher B: Today we are going to exercise our powers of concentration. Concentration is essential to good reading. I want you to read silently the selection I just passed out to you. As you read, I want you to note, by making a mark on a separate piece of paper, if and whenever your

> concentration drifts. After the reading, you are to write a brief description of your experience with concentration while reading this selection. Did your concentration drift? How many times? Were you able to bring it back? If so, how? Then lastly, I want you to briefly summarize what you read. I would like you to include this as your journal entry for today.

The above is a metacognitive exercise which integrates a teaching technique and a journal writing activity. It requires students to grasp a superordinate understanding of the cognitive techniques they are using while reading. The journal activity allows each student to express his/her thoughts.

Teacher B Skills Writing Activity

Teacher B used a discussion activity in both his skills and collaborative classes. The skills class discussion, unlike the collaborative class, did not adhere to the four collaborative strategies: predict, clarify, question, and summarize. The skills discussion as conducted by Teacher B was less structured. Teacher B selected articles from a magazine or newspaper usually concerning some current issue. Students were allowed ample time to read this article and a teacher-led or small group discussion would ensue.

Teacher B: This article from The New York Times is entitled "Should Two Live Crew be Banned?" I'll give you ample time to read this selection before we begin discussion.

[silence.]

Teacher B: Okay Group! What is the author's point of view?

Student 1: Well, the author seems to think that this group should not be banned.

Teacher B: Yeah, and why not?

Student 2: Ah...because there are any number of White artists and groups that are equally as provocative, and not only are they not banned, but they are accepted as mainstream.

Teacher B: Good, there's that word 'provocative' and what does it mean in this context?

Student 2: It means "thought provoking."

Student 3: It means "suggestive."

Teacher B: Good. Now name a few of the white artists or groups that are mentioned by the author.

Student 4: Madonna, Billy Idol, even Bruce Springsteen and the East Street Band, all use provocative lyrics and gestures.

Teacher B: And...And what do you think Student 5. Should Two Live Crew be banned?

Student 5: Yes, I think they should be banned, the lyrics are obscene to me!

Student 6: I find them offensive too.

Student 7: I think if White groups can do it then so can Black.

Teacher B: Do what Student 7? Be specific.

Student 7: Well, I say, if it's okay for White groups to use obscene lyrics and be otherwise provocative, then it's okay for Black groups to do it too.

Teacher B: I see your point Student 7, but I'm sure some of your classmates will differ with you....

Teacher A Skills Writing/Discussion Activity

Teacher A did not use writing activities in skills class unless they were included as part of the assigned text. For example, the second half of the text included reading selections. These selections were assigned to students as homework on a regular basis. Each selection was followed with ten multiple choice questions and one or two writing topics. The center for the writing activity in Teacher A's class was these writing practice exercises which also became a topic for some class discussion.

Teacher A Collaborative Writing/Discussion Activity

Students in the skills class of Teacher A had a home assignment each night to answer, in written form, all study guide questions for the assigned reading. These were collected each day, reviewed each class and graded.

Teacher A: Last class I asked you to read the selection "Easy Job, Good Wages" for today's class. Today, I want you to prepare your thoughts on the writing practice exercise in the text. List in a paragraph all the unhappy aspects of Colon's experience on the job.

[silence.]

Teacher A: Okay. Now, you've had ample time to collect and jot down your thoughts. What were some of the unhappy aspects of Colon's experience on this job?

Student 1: He had to remain seated all day.

Student 2: The water in the tubs was very cold.

Student 3: The job was boring and monotonous.

Student 4: Some of the glue was hard to get off.

Student 5: The job made your finger-thumb nail ugly, and made the thumb red and swollen.

Student 6: The job didn't pay very much money. I believe it was 23 cents per hour.

Teaching Technique

Curricula Sequence and Amount of Practice: Skills

The curricula sequence or order in which material was presented was one component of an instructional strategy. Teacher B, using the skills method, did not sequence the skills taught to follow that presented by the text's author. Teacher A did not reorganize the sequence presented in the textbook. Teacher B omitted eight of the chapters and presented the skills in the following order:

Chapter 5, Reading for the Main Idea;
Chapter 6, Reading for Information;
Chapter 7, Recognizing Paragraph Patterns;
Chapter 8, Making Inference;
Chapter 10, Drawing Conclusions;
Chapter 12, Evaluating Ideas; and,
Chapter 13, Notetaking.

Teacher B completed 7 of 15 chapters in part one of the required text, and two of the reading selections in part two. By contrast, Teacher A completed in sequence 12 of 15 chapters in part one of the required text, and 12 of 15 reading selections in part two. [For sequence see Appendix D]

Amount of Practice: Collaborative

With his collaborative classes, Teacher B completed only one novel. Down These Mean Streets over the course of the semester. Teacher B was probably unable to complete both novels because he included other activities in his course. By contrast, Teacher A's class completed both novels, Kindred and Down These Mean Streets, respectively.

Concentration v. Timed Reading

Teacher B preferred the use of untimed concentration practice exercises while Teacher A used timed reading exercises. Teacher B selected articles from, then current, newspapers and magazines for this purpose. Teacher A used Barnell-Loft's Specific Skills Series, Book L (12th grade level), for main ideas, drawing conclusions and, getting the facts as well as passages from the required texts for both the collaborative and skills classes for this purpose.

Introduction to Concentration Exercise Teacher B

Teacher B: Good concentration is a key to good reading. Today, I want you to practice good concentration. Cast out all intrusive thoughts. Focus on the reading task at hand. Wherever you experience intrusive thoughts, please make a mark on a separate piece of paper. That way we can keep count of how often your concentration wanders. I will not time you as you read this article, but I do expect you to read at a comfortable pace.

[silence.]

Introduction to Timed Reading Exercise Teacher A

Teacher A: I will time your reading of this passage and the answering of the ten multiple choice questions which follow. This week you are allowed ten minutes. Each week the amount of time allowed will be reduced by 30 seconds. Are there any questions about the instructions?

[silence.]

The above two introductions to concentration and timed reading exercises by Teacher B and Teacher A, respectively, both take the form of teacher soliloquies and emphasize different skills.

Opening The Class

Teacher B frequently prompted and sometimes coaxed his students to review what work was done in his class before beginning the day's lesson.

Teacher B:	What did we do in our last class last Wednesday?
Student 1:	We worked on Chapter 7. It was about how to recognize paragraph patterns.
Teacher B:	Yeah, and what are some of the different paragraph patterns that we discussed?
Student 8:	Listing details, and comparison and contrast.
Student 9:	We also discussed the ordering of ideas and means of recognizing paragraph patterns.
Teacher B:	Very good, and today we will complete our work with the topic of recognizing paragraph patterns by working with the last pattern in your text, cause and effect.

Teacher B would establish the link between what was covered last class and the activity for the day. By contrast, Teacher A, reviewed for the students what was done in his last class and linked that to the lesson for the day in a teacher soliloquy.

Teacher B:	Last class we talked about figurative language. We discussed some of the different forms figurative language can take such as metaphors, similies and idioms. Today, I would like us to practice recognizing some of the different types of figurative language in the poems on pages 224 in the textbook.

Summary

First, Teacher B's classes were offered a broader repertoire of activities than did Teacher A's classes. These activities, though interesting and stimulating, were time consuming. Second, Teacher B and A's classes emphasized different teaching techniques. Teacher B seemed more concerned with the development of language skills in a holistic fashion while Teacher A was more reading test focused. The amount of practice and the sequence of the presentation of reading skills differed between Teacher B and Teacher A.

Sequitur

Becoming a participant observer in the classroom enhances some aspects of teaching, yet makes others more difficult. The teacher/researcher's role also differs in many aspects from that of an outside observer.

The teacher in the classroom is an insider, an accepted member of the institution. The teacher's insider knowledge enables him/her to operate within the system. However, from the vantage point of the students and because of his/her powerful position, the teacher is not a peer of the students and, thus, is also an outsider.

The teacher who elects to study his/her students reaps benefits from the role of researcher. He/she gets an opportunity to step outside and see the institution, the class, and even him/herself as an outsider might.

Classroom research affords the teacher a larger frame of reference for understanding his/her own teaching and the students' learning than normal teaching provides. As a teacher/researcher, before using the collaborative and teacher-led skills methods, each was studied. This activity provided insight which may not have come about through simply teaching. The researcher is more eager to learn rather than being the teacher with all-knowing authority. From the perspective of an objective observer, respect mingled with curiosity helps the teacher suppress the take-charge urge. This endeavor reemphasized the importance of listening carefully to what student's say.

While the teacher/researcher enjoyed the advantages of the insider role as a participant/observer, carrying out this dual role also presented problems:

- The reacher/researcher must deal on a daily basis with the fact that he/she is not able to devote him/herself exclusively to the research process.
- The teacher/researcher must confront his/her own blind spots. As an insider his/her closeness to the situation is capable of creating barriers that hinder him/her from seeing all dimensions of the bigger picture.
- Just as the teacher/researcher cannot lend him/herself exclusively to research, nor can he/she devote him/herself exclusively to teaching.
- The research sometimes presents the teacher/researcher with difficult choices, whether to attend to data collecting or to student needs. The students are no longer simply students - they are student/subject.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abell, Adelaide M. "Rapid Reading Advantage and Methods," Educational Review, VIII (October, 1894), 283-86.

Alvermann, D.E., Smith, L.C., & Readance, J.E. Prior Knowledge Activation and the Comprehension of Compatible Text. Reading Research Quarterly. 20 (4), 420-30, 1985.

Ammons, R.B. and Hieronymous, A.N. "Critical Evaluation of a College Program for Reading Improvement," Journal of Educational Psychology, 38: 449-70, December, 1947.

Anderson, L. What are Students Doing When They Do All that Seatwork? Inc. Fisher & D. Berliner (eds.) Perspectives on Instructional Time, New York: Longman, 1985.

Arnold, E. Reading: How to teach It. Boston, MA: Silver, Burdett, 1899.

Barr, A. Characteristic Differences in the Teaching Performance of Good and Poor Teachers of Social Studies, Bloomington: IL. Public School Publishing, 1929.

Barker, J. "The Retraining of America." Successful Meetings. (April, 1990) pp.34-43.

Belcher, M.J. "The Effect of Increased Reading Efficiency Upon Semester Grade Point Averages," Journal of Reading, March 1971,381-384,422.

Bellack, Arno A., Herbert M. Kliebard, Ronald T. Hyman, Frank L. Smith Jr. Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Bereiter, C. & Bird, M. Identification and Teaching of Reading Strategies. Cognition and Instruction, 2 (2), 131-156, 1985.

Breyer, T.P., "A College Course in General Reading," English Journal (College Edition), XII (June, 1923), 377-383.

Binet, A. Modern Ideas on Children. Paris: Ernst Flamarian, 1909.

Blake, Maybelle B., and Dearborn, Walter F., "The Improvement Reading Habits," Journal of Higher Education, VI (February, 1935), 83-85.

Blake, Walter S., Jr., A Survey and Evaluation of Study Skills Programs at the College Level in the United States and Possessions. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, 1953.

Bliesmer, Emery P. Fifth Yearbook. Southwest Reading Conference, Oscar S. Causey (ed.), Texas Christian University, 1955.

Bliesmer, Emery P. First, Second, and Third Yearbooks. Southwest Reading Conference, Oscar S. Causey (ed.), Texas Christian University, 1955.

Bliesmer, Emery P. Seventh Yearbook. Southwest Reading Conference, Oscar S. Causey (ed.), Texas Christian University, 1955.

Bok, Derek. Higher Learning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986.

Bridge, D. Education, Democracy and Discussion. Windsor, England: NFER Publishing, 1979.

Brown, A.L., Palinscar, A.S. & Purcell, L. Poor Readers: Teachers Don't Label, In U. Neiser (ed.) The Academic Performance of Minority Children: A New Perspective, Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1984.

Brown, G. "Teaching College Phonics at City College of San Francisco," in Frank L. Christ (ed.), Creating Opportunities for Skillful Reading, 1970.

Buffone, Nicholas J. A Survey of College and University Reading Programs and an Analysis of the Reading Program at the University of Oklahoma. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Oklahoma. Norman, Oklahoma, 1965.

Butler, Octavia E. Kindred. Boston: Beacon Press 1979.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Annual Report. Carnegie Foundation : New York, 1989.

Carroll, Robert P. & Jacobs, Charles C., "Drill in Silent Reading for College Freshmen," School and Society, XXX (November 9, 1929), 656-658.

Causey, Oscar S. "A Report on College Reading Programs in the Nation," Evaluating College Reading Programs, Fourth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, (February, 1955), 109-120.

Chall, J.S. "Interpretations of the Results of Reading Tests." Measurement and Evaluation of Reading. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970.

Chall, Jeanne. "Adult Literacy: New Enduring Problem." Phi Delta Kappan, November, 1987, pp. 190-196.

Chall, Jeanne S. "The Great Debate: Ten Years Later, with a Modest Proposal Proposal for Reading Stages." In Theory and Practice of Early Reading. Eds. Lauren B. Resnick and Phyllis A. Weaver. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Laurence Erlbaum, 1979.

Charters, W.W., "Remedial Reading in College," The Journal of Higher Education, XII (March, 1941), 117-122.

Colvin, C.R. "What Is Being Done in College Reading Programs in Pennsylvania," Journal of Developmental Reading, No. 1 (Autumn,1961), 70-72.

Colvin, S. S. An Introduction to High School Teaching. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Crismore, A. (Ed.) Landscapes: A State-of-the-Art Assessment of Reading Comprehension, 1974-1984. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Education, 1985.

Cross, K.P. Beyond the Open Door: New Students in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Cross, K.P. Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction and Reshaping the Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Davis, E. The Teacher Taught; or, The Principles and Modes of Teaching. Boston, MA: Marsh, Capen, Lyon, & Webb, 1939.

Deal, Roy W. "The Development of Reading and Study Habits in College Students," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXV (April, 1934), 258-273.

Dearborn,Walter F., and Anderson, Irving H., : "A New Method for Phrasing and for Increasing the Size of Reading Fixations," Psychological Record. I (December, 1937), 457-475.

Dearborn, Walter F, and Anderson, Irving H., "Controlled Reading by Means of a Motion Picture Technique," Psychological Record,II (May,1938), 219-227.

Dearborn, Walter F., and Wilking,Vincent S., "Improving Reading of College Freshmen," School Review, XLIX (November, 1941),668-678.

Dearborn, Walter F. "Professor Cattell's Studies in Reading and Perception, The Psychological Researches of James McKeen Cattell," XXII, 4. New York: *Science Press*, 1914, 34-45.

Deem, James M. *The Relationship of Sociocultural Distance to the Reading and Writing Performance of Community College Basic Skills Students*. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1981).

Department of Educational Research and Improvement. College Level Remediation. *FRSS # 19,* Washington, D.C.: Dept. of Educational Statistics, 1985.

Dewey, J. *How We Think.* Boston: Heath, 1933.

Dillon, J. T. Research on Questioning and Discussion, *Educational Leadership*, 42, 50-56, 1984.

Durkin, M. J. & Biddle, B.J. *The Study of Teaching.* New York: Holt, 1974.

Durkin, D. What Classroom Observations Reveal About Reading Comprehension Instruction, *Reading Research Quarterly,* 14, 481-533, 1979.

Duggins, Lydia A., *A Program for the Teachers College 1946 Summer Reading Center*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.Teachers College Columbia University: New York, New York, 1946.

Flanders, Ned A. *Analyzing Teaching Behaviors.* Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pubilshing Co. 1970.

Fry, Edward. "The Orangoutang Score." *Reading Teacher*, v.24 n4 pp.360-62.

Gallagher, M. C. & Pearson, P. D. The Role of Reading In Content Area Instruction. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Florida, 1982.

Geerlofs M.W., and Kling,Martin, "Current Practices in College and Adult Developmental Reading Programs," *Journal of Reading*, II (April, 1968), 517-20.

Grannis, Joseph C. Lecture in Qualitative-Quantitative Series. Teachers College, Curriculum and Teaching Department, Feb., 1989.

Goodlad, J. *A Place Called School*, New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1983.

Goodnow, J.J. "The Nature of Intelligent Behavior: Questions Caused by Cross-Cultural Studies." *The Nature of*

Intelligence, New York: John Wiley, 1976.

Guilder, W.S., and Coleman,J.H., Journal of the American Association of College Registras, XVII (October,1941), 16-27.

Hall, S. R. Lectures on School Reading. Boston, Mass: Richardson, Lord & Hollbrook, 1829.

Hoetker, J. & Ahlbrand, W. P. The Persistence of Recitation. American Educational Research Journal, 1979,61, 145-167.

Huey, Edmund B., The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading, Macmillan Co.: New York, 1908.

Humber, Wilber Jr. "The Relationship between Reading Efficiency and Academic Success in Selected Univ. Curricular," Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXV (January, 1944), 17-26.

Huslin, R.A. "What's Happening in College and University Reading Programs: Report of a Recent Survey," Reading World, March, 1975, 202-214.

Katz, C.and Wright,F. "The Effects of a Reading and Study Skills Program on Academic Performance and Perseverance." Journal of General Education, Summer 1977, 29, 89-96.

Keagy, J. M. Early Intellectual Education. American Journal of Education, 1826,I, 672-680.

Kingston, Albert J. "Analysis of Reading Questionnaire for Texas Society for College Teachers of Education." in Oscar L. Causey, (ed.), What the Colleges are Doing in in Reading Improvement Programs, Third Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities, Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas, 1954, 67-70.

Landon, J. The Principles and Practices of Teaching and Class Management. London: Edinburgh University Press, 1899.

Lederman, Marie J. Assessment and Improvement of the Academic Skills of Entering Freshmen: A National Study. Research Monograph Series No. 5. ERIC #ED238973, 1983.

Leedy, Paul D. A History of the Origin and Development of Instruction in Reading Improvement at the College Level, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, New York University, New York, 1958.

Linquist, Franklin R. Reading Services Provided for Students in Representative Colleges and Universities, Academic

Year, 1947-48, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Education. Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1949.

Lowe, A. J. "State Survey of College Reading Improvement Services," in Ralph C. Staiger and Culbreth Melton (ed.), New Developments in Programs and Procedures for College Adult Reading, Twelfth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1963, 85-86.

Lowe, A. J. "Surveys of College Reading Improvement Programs: 1929-1966," Junior College and Adult Reading Programs/Expanding Fields. Sixteenth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference. Milwaukee,Wisconsin: The National Reading Conference, 1967, 79.

Lovitt, T.C. & Hansen, C.L. The Contingent use of Skipping and Drilling to Improve Oral Reading and Comprehension. Journal Of Learning Disabilities, 9 (8), 486, 1976.

Mc Caul, Robert L. "The Cost of Remedial Reading Programs in Eighteen Colleges," School and Society, LVI (October, 1942), 361-364.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. Teaching Tips. Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Company, 1978.

Marshall,R. Higher Education's Impending (and yes, necessary) Shake-Up. On Campus, 9, 8-9, 1989.

Marrou, H.I. A History of Education in Antiquity. George Lamb, translator. Madison, WI: University of Winconsin Press, 1982.

Miklas, Milton J. An Analysis of Remedial Reading Programs in California Junior, Four Year Colleges and Universities, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of California at Los Angeles, 1954.

Moore, E.C. "An Experiment in Teaching College Students How to Study," School and Society, II. (July, 1915), 100-107.

Morley, C.A.B. A Practical Guide to Composition. Hartford, CT: R. White, 1839.

Murray, Thelma T. An Appraisal of Reading Programs in Negro Colleges, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, 1951.

National Assessment for Educational Progress. Literacy: Profiles of America's Young Adults. Princeton, N.J.:

Educational Testing Services, 1988.

National Society for the Study of Education. "Reading Instruction for College Students," *New Materials for Instruction, Nineteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, Part I Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Co., 1920.

New York Times, Students' Skills Termed 'Dreadfully Inadequate' B8, cols. 3-6 Jan 10, 1990.

Nickerson, R.S., Perkins, D.N., & Smith, E.E. *The Teaching of Thinking.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1985.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. "College Level Remediation." *FRSS Report # 19*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Education Office of Statistics, 1986.

Palincsar, A.S. & Brown, A.L. The Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension-fostering and Comprehension-monitoring Activities. *Cognition And Teaching*,1 (2), 117-175, 1984.

Palincsar, A.S. The Role of Dialogue in Providing Scaffolded Instruction, *Educational Psychologist*, 21 (1 & 2), 73-98, 1986.

Palincsar, A.S. & Brown A. L. Teaching and Practicing Thinking Skills to Promote Comprehension in the Context of Group Problem Solving, *Journal of Remedial & Special Education*, pp. 53-59, 1988.

Parker, F. W. *Talks on Teaching.* New York: Barnes, 1883.

Pearson, P. D. & Janice A. Dole. Explicit Comprehension Instruction: A Review of Research and a new Conceptualization of Instruction. Technical Report # 427, Champaign, Ill. 1988.

Parr, Frank W. *A Reading Program for the Inefficient Silent Reader in College*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. State University of Iowa, 1929.

Parr, Frank W. "Teaching College Students How to Read." *Journal of Higher Education*, 2, (June, 1931), 328-30.

Parr, Frank W. "The Extent of Remedial Reading Work in State Universities in the United States," *School and Society*, XXXI (April 19, 1930), 547-548.

Parry, Douglas F. "Reading Gains in a Freshman at Remedial Program at Syracuse University, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXII (November, 1941), 624-630.

Pressey, Luella C. *A Manual of Reading Exercises for Freshmen*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1928, 112.

Pressey, Luella C., "College Remedial Reading Classes," *English Journal* (College Edition), XXIX (Sept., 1930), 566-69.

Pressey, Luella C. "College Students and Reading." *Journal of Higher Education*,II. (January,1931), 30-34.

Pressey, Luella C., "The Permanent Effects of Training in Methods of Study on College Success," *School and Society*, XXVII (September 29, 1928), 403-404.

Resnick, Daniel and Resnick, Lauren, "The Nature of Literacy: An Historical Exploration." *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 47,no. 3, August, 1977, pp.370-85.

Rice, J. M. *The Public School System of the United States.* New York: Century, 1893.

Robinson, Francis P. *Analysis and Treatment of Reading Inadequacies in College Freshmen*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Iowa City, Iowa: University of Iowa, 1930.

Robinson, Francis P. "Can College Freshmen in the Lowest Tenth in Reading be Aided Scholastically?" *School and Society*, XXXIV (December 19, 1931), 843-846.

Robinson, Francis P. *Effective Study*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Romanes, George J. *Mental Evaluation in Animals*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1883.

Roueche, Susanne D. *College Responses to Low-Achieving Students: A National Survey*. ERIC ED# 248924.

Schallert, D. & Tierney, R. Learning from Expository Text: The Interaction of Text Structure with Reader Characteristics. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1982.

Schantz, Maria Eileen. *A Survey of Reading Improvement Programs at Selected Two and Four Year State Colleges and Universities*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Teachers College Columbia University. New York, New York, 1976.

Schleich, Miriam. *The Evaluation of a College Reading Program*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation.

Teachers College Columbia University. New York, New York, 1958.

Sirotkin, K. A. What You See Is What You Get--Consistency, Persistency, and Mediocrity in Classroom. Harvard Education Review, 53, 16-31, 1983.

Smith, Herbert P. Methods of Improving the Reading Rate of College Students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. New York University: New York, New York, 1932.

Smith, Louis Milde and Geoffrey, William. The Complexities of an Urban Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Smith, Nila B. A Historical Analysis of American Reading Instruction. Published Doctoral Dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Smith, Nila B. "Remedial Instruction in Reading with College Freshmen." Bulletin of the School of Education: Bureau of Cooperative Research, Indiana University Bloomington, Indiana, 1938.

Smith, Nila Barton. American Reading Instruction. International Reading Instruction, 1980.

Stahl, Norman A and Hynd,Cynthia R. "Avenues for Chronicling and Researching the History of College Reading and Study Skills Instruction." Journal of Reading, XXIX (January, 1986), pp. 331-341.

Stanford, G. & Stanford, B. D. Learning Discussion Skills Through Games. New York: Citation Press, 1969.

Stevens, R. Stenographic Reports of High School Lessons. Teachers College Record, 11, 1-66, 1910.

Stodolsky, S. S., Fergguson, T. L. & Wimpleberg, K. The Recitation Persists, But What Does It Look Like? Journal of Curriculum Studies, 13,121-130, 1981.

Stone, C.W. and Colvin, Carl, "How to Study as a Source of Motive in Educational Psychology," Journal of Educational Psychology,XI (September, 1920),348-54.

Straff, William W. Comparisons, Contrasts, and Evaluation of Selected College Reading Programs. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Temple University: Philadelphia Pennsylvania, 1986.

Strang, Ruth. "The Improvement of Reading in College," The English Journal (College Edition), 1937, 26:548-59.

Thomas, Piri. *Down These Mean Streets.* New York: Vantage Press, 1974.

Thompson, William H. "An Experiment in Remedial Reading," *School and Society*, XXXIV (August, 1931), 156-58.

Thwing, Charles F. *A History of Higher Education*. New York: D) Appleton and Co., 1906.

Tovey, D. Improving Children's Reading Comprehension Abilities. *The Reading Teacher,* 1976, 30, 288-292.

Traxler, Arthur E. "Current Organization and \procedure in Remedial Teaching." *Journal of Experimantal Education*, 1953, 22:305-12.

Triggs, Frances O. "Current Problems in Remedial Reading for College Readihg Students," *School and Society*, LIII (March 22, 1941), 376-79.

Triggs, Frances O. "Remedial Reading Programs: Evidence of Their Development." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, XXXIII (December, 1942), 678-85.

Turner, Caroline S., Zais, E. and Gatewood, L.T. "The Effect of a Developmental Program on University Grades." *Journal of Reading*, April 1974, 17:531-37.

Vygotsky, L.S. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, Mass.:Harvard Univ. Press, 1978.

Walker, George H.,Jr. "Remedial Reading Programs in Negro Colleges and Universities," *Journal of Negro Education*, 1946,15: 119-121.

Webster, N. A. *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language, Part I,* Hartford, CT: Hudson & Goodwin, 1783.

Whimbey, Arthur. "A 15th Grade Reading Level for High School Seniors?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, November, 1987.

Witty, Paul A. "Practice in Corrective Reading in Colleges and Universities," *School and Society*, 1940 52: 564-68.

Witty, Paul A. "Practices in Corrective Reading and Study Habits," *Journal of Educational Research*, XXXVII (April, 1944), 571-586.

Witty, Paul A. "Some Results of a Remedial Reading Program for College Students," *School and Society*, December 13, 1952, 76: 378-80.

Wood, P., Bruner, J. & Ross, G. The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and*

Psychiatry, 17, 89-100, 1976.

Wood, Keith R. "A Survey of Reading Programs in Wisconsin," in Oscar L. Causey (ed.), Techniques and Procedures in College and Adult Reading Programs, Sixth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for College and Universities, Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas, 1957, pp. 134-38.

Wood, Susan H. The People's Legacy: A History of Joliet Junior College. 1901-84. Henry, Illinois: M & D Printing Co., 1987.

Appendix A

Lovitt & Hansen Criterion

The turkey, our Thanksgiving favorite, has been across the Atlantic Ocean twice. In 1517, when the Spanish explorer, Cortez, came to this continent, he was fascinated to find that roast turkey was a favorite of the Indians who lived here. Captivated by turkey's succulent taste, Cortez and his fellow conquistadors took some of the unusual birds back home with them. Soon turkeys were being raised all over Europe as a popular delicacy. When the Pilgrims left England for the New World about 100 years later, they decided to take some of the birds with them, and the turkey returned home.

Excerpted from Barnell-Loft's Advanced Specific Skills Series.

Appendix B

Teacher-Designed Post-Test Reading Selection

Love and Marriage: An Historical View

The ancient Greeks perceived a schism between sexual and spiritual love. They distinguish between eros, carnal love associated with the sensual aspects of love and agape' spiritual love which is associated with protective and altruistic feelings. Agape' is the non-demanding side of love, which is demonstrated, for example, in parents' love for their children and in the genuine concern that we have for the life and growth of those whom we love.

Christianity, following the Jewish tradition distinguished between love and sex. Under the influence of the church, sexuality was suppressed and women were idealized as nonsexual beings. The idealization of women reached its zenith in the adoration of the Virgin Mother.

In the eleventh century, courtly love, a new male-female relationship emerged, which combined the idealization of women with chivalry, the knights' code of honor. Love became a novel and fashionable subject for discussion among aristocrats and even devised rules to regulate lovers' behavior. Love came to mean a romantic relationship with someone other than one's spouse. It is synonymous with desire, yearning for what one could never entirely possess.

A liaison was sometimes formed between a knight and a lady whose husband, more than likely, was away for many years fighting a crusade. The knight pledged unselfish service to the lady. She was his source of inspiration. He fought tournaments in her honor and praised her goodness and beauty in song and poetry. In keeping with the Christian concept of sex, chastity was observed in these affairs. Occasionally the "purity" of the love was put to the test, when a couple slept together nude but refrained from sexual intercourse.

The courtly love relationship developed out of the social conditions of medieval life. Marriage in the Middle Ages had several clearly defined functions: financial benefits, personal protection, procreation, but love was not among them. Romantic love and marriage were two separate entities that fulfilled separate needs. If marriage entailed obligation, love on the contrary, was freely extended and returned. It enabled men and women to experience feelings of tenderness for one another; it introduced gentleness and restraint into the male-female relationship, and it ensured sexual fidelity in marriage. As knighthood declined, however, so did the sexual inhibitions of romantic lovers, and love and sex began to merge, at least, outside of marriage.

The Renaissance period continued to deny the existence of love in marriage. A European nobleman may have had as many as three women in his life: a wife for representative purposes, a mistress for aesthetic conversation and a women to fulfill his sexual needs. Yet, somewhere during the Renaissance the idea that sex and romantic love was a prelude to marriage began to take hold.

Surprisingly, the Puritans of the seventeenth century, whom we regard in a very different light, were, in fact, appreciative of physical closeness coupled with emotional warmth. It is true that they put people in the stocks for committing minor social transgressions such as gossiping, but they also engaged in bundling, where sweethearts spent long cold winter nights in bed fully clothed. A New England custom for two centuries, bundling afforded several practical benefits: warmth, privacy, and the avoidance of a return journey in the treacherous darkness. Moreover, the Puritans apparently considered sex a good and natural part of marriage.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, politics, economics and technology combined to underscore the need for stable monogamous family life. The industrial revolution fostered the idea that the family was a refuge, a safe harbor, from the isolation and alienation of a rapidly industrialized society. Kindness, altruism, self-sacrifice, peace, harmony: all were to be found in the ideal nineteenth century Victorian family.

What happened to sex? The Victorians had large families but sexual desire was regarded as an exclusive male phenomenon, women were supposed to be passionless, actually devoid of feeling. Men sought sexual fulfillment outside of marriage, and prostitution flourished on a grand scale. A double standard of behavior was recognized.

In the twentieth century, in Western countries particularly, romantic love has become a pre- and corequisite for marriage. However, soaring divorce rates in recent decades may indicate that the romance requirement has a disruptive effect on the institution of marriage itself. In explanation psychologists suggest that we often seek in our mates those qualities which we, ourselves, lack with a resulting personality clash that can destroy even the strongest romantic attraction. Moreover, the changing self-image of women is reflected in modern marriage. Unwilling to play traditional nurturing roles, eager to achieve career goals, outspoken about their own sexual needs, many women have concluded that marriage with or without romance is not as important a factor in their lives as it was for their mothers and grandmothers.

In despair, modern romantics are experimenting with various forms of marriage: open marriage; marriage by contract; homosexual marriage; group marriage; childless marriage; celibate marriage; and no marriage (living together without benefit of ceremony). The search for eros and agape' together forever, continues.

Appendix C

Collaborative Teaching Procedures

Human Subjects Statement for Collaborative Group

Introduction:

"For the coming weeks we will be working to improve your ability to understand what you read. Let's discuss for a moment the various reasons we sometimes have difficulty understanding what we are reading."

Discussion

"One reason I particularly want to call to your attention is that sometimes we are so busy figuring out what the words are that we fail to pay much attention to what the words and sentences mean. For the coming weeks we will be learning a way to pay more attention to what we are reading. I will teach you to do the following activities as you read:

1. To think of important questions that might be asked about what is being read and to be sure that you can answer those questions.
2. To summarize the most important information that you have read.
3. To predict what the author might discuss next in the passage.
4. To point out when something is unclear in the passage or doesn't make sense, and then to see if we can make sense of it.

These activities will help you to keep your attention on what you are reading and they will help you to be sure that you are understanding what you are reading.

The way that you will learn these activities is by taking turns in the role of teacher during your reading group sessions. When I am the teacher I will show you how I read carefully by telling you the question or questions I made up while reading, by summarizing the most important information I read, by predicting what I think the author might discuss next. I will also tell you if I find anything I read to be unclear or confusing and how I made sense out of it.

When you are the teacher you will first ask the rest of us the question you made up while reading. You will tell us if our answer was correct. You will summarize the most important information you learned while reading. You will also tell us if you found anything to be confusing in the passage. Several times through the novel, you will also be asked to predict what you think might be discussed next in the selection. When you are the teacher the rest of us will answer your questions and comment on your summary.

These are activities which I hope you will learn and use not only when you are here in reading class but whenever you want to understand and remember what you are reading, for example, in criminal justice, police science, psychology, science or history."

After introducing the procedure, take time to answer the students' questions. They may be concerned about homework, grading, etc.

Regarding Grades:

"Each day after we have read a passage and taught each other about the passage, you will be given a shorter passage which you are to read carefully to yourself. When you have finished reading, you will be given a set of questions to answer. Your performance on these questions as well as your effort to participate in the teaching of the passage will be used to determine your grade. You will be told how you are progressing as we work together."

Daily Procedure:

1. Insert the day's tape and turn the recorder on.
2. For the initial days of the training, take a few minutes to review the four activities we are learning: question asking, summarizing important information, predicting what the author will discuss next, and pointing out when something doesn't make sense. Remind the students that these activities they are to be using not only in reading class but whenever they are reading something to understand and remember information.
3. Remind the students that a person who is working with you on this project will be listening to the tapes and writing down everything they discuss. For this reason they need to speak loudly and clearly, they need to speak one at a time, and they need to keep background noise down as much as possibly.

4. Pass out the treatment passage for the day.
5. Explain that you will be the teacher for the first segment.
6. Instruct the students to read silently whatever portion you determine is appropriate. At the beginning, it will probably be easier to work paragraph by paragraph.
7. When everyone has completed the first segment, model the following:

   "The question which I thought is one a teacher might ask is ________." Have the students answer your question. They may refer to the text if that is necessary.

   "I would summarize the important information in this paragraph in the following way: ___________."

   "From the title of this passage, I would predict that the author will discuss __________."

   If appropriate, "When I read this part, I found the following to be unclear __________." Then explain how you make sense of it, if indeed you are able to, e.g., "I reread, I figured out that 'it' must refer to __________." If you were unable to make sense of it, explain to the students how you intend to make sense of it, e.g., it might be that the point will be clarified as you read on, it might be that you will look up in a dictionary what you were unsure of, or it might be that the author has made a mistake.

8. Invite the students to make comments regarding your teaching and the passage, e.g., "Was there more important information?" "Does anyone have more to add to my predictions?" "Did anyone find something else that was confusing?"
9. Assign the next segment to be read silently. In the initial days, it would be best if you were to assume responsibility for the second segment as well as the first, and modelled the activities again.
10. Assign a third segment and assign a teacher as well. Begin first with students who are more verbal and whom you suspect will have less difficulty with the activities. To maintain the attention of the entire group, refrain from assigning students on a "round robin" basis.
11. Coach the student teacher through the activities as necessary, e.g., "What questions do you think would be asked by a teacher?"
    "Call on someone to answer your question."
    "Is their answer correct?"
    "How would you summarize the important information in that part?"
    "Do you have any predictions regarding what the author might discuss next?"
    "Was there anything unclear in the text?"

Encourage other students to participate in the dialogue but always give the student teacher the opportunity to go first and lead the dialogue. Be sure to give the student teacher plenty of feedback and praise for his/her participation--e.g., "You asked that question well; it was very clear."

"That was a very good question because it covered important information."

"Nice summary!"

"Excellent prediction; let's see if you're right."

"O.K. That was interesting information. It was information about what I would call detail, in the passage. Can you tell us the most important information in that segment?"

"Remember, we need to word our question so that it makes sense and so that we can give you the answer you had in mind." For example, if a student asked, "What did scientists think?" the question needs to be more complete: "What do scientists think happened to the first reptiles?"

12. As the training days go by, try to remove yourself more and more from the dialogue so that the student teacher initiates the activities himself or herself and other students provide feedback. Your role will continue to be monitoring, keeping students "on track," helping students over obstacles. Throughout the training however, continue to take your turn as teacher, modelling at least once a session.

13. Each day while there are still 12-15 minutes left to the period, collect the training passage and hand out the day's assessment passage. Tell the students to read it carefully so that they can answer questions when they have finished. Collect the assessment passage when they have read it, and hand them the accompanying questions and place in the day's folder.

You do not need to have the recorder running once you have finished the dialogue.

Appendix D

Introduction To Skills Method

Learning to read is not learning just a single skill. It is learning many skills that work together and build on each other. Each time you improve any one skill, it strengthens all others. As your vocabulary improves, you will be able to understand and interpret your reading. And as you learn to comprehend and interpret better, you gain more clues about the meaning of unfamiliar words.

The text for this class is Reading Skills Handbook by Wiener and Bazerman fifth edition. The first half of this book teaches the basic skills of reading. Each skill is explained clearly in its own section. Exercises follow each section so that you can practice each skill as you learn about it. The second half of this book has reading selections with questions.

Students will be assigned to read and do all exercises per class in both a chapter and a reading selection from this textbook. Class will be conducted with the instructor delivering a lecture on the skill covered in the assigned chapter. Then students will be called upon to answer each of the exercises. Students will be required to explain the reason(s) for his/her choice. The instructor will offer guidance as necessary. This procedure will continue round-robin until all exercises have been answered. After each exercise, students will be encouraged to ask questions if they are unclear about an answer. The instructor will respond to each student's questions. After having exhausted the activities in the chapter, the instructor will focus upon the assigned reading selection. The reading exercises will provide the focus for this portion of the class activities. The same procedure will be followed as in the review of the chapter.

Appendix E

Human Subject Statement for Skills Group

1. During each class, the instructor will lecture for 20-25 minutes on a topic related to the reading skill assigned as homework in The Reading Skills Handbook.
2. In the order presented in the textbook, readings and exercises will be assigned as homework to students relating to one reading skill at a time.
3. The instructor will lead the class in a review of the important concepts presented in the assigned reading.
4. Students will be called upon to orally read and respond to each exercise.
5. The recitation method will be used exclusively.
    - a.) The instructor initiates the sequence by calling on a student to respond to an exercise or question.
    - b.) The nominated student responds by giving the answer.
    - c.) The teacher comments on the answer before going on to the next exercise and calling on the next student.
6. The instructor will ask if a student has any questions concerning answers given in this activity.
7. All student questions concerning any exercise(s) will be addressed to the student's satisfaction.
8. Each class students will be assigned as homework a reading selection (usually an essay) and to answer all questions in the exercise that follows.

9. The same description of recitation will be followed

as presented in items 5, 6, and 7 of this procedure.

Appendix F

Student Survey

Directions: Below are several questions concerning your feelings about the reading course you have just completed. Please indicate how you liked each of the various aspects of the course by **circling the number** in front of the appropriate response. Use the coding provided in the box below. **Please answer every question on this survey.**

Did not like 1	Liked a little 2	Liked somewhat 3	Liked a lot 4	Liked extremely 5

1.	Instructional approach (e.g., the way the material was approached by the instructor, the techniques used, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
2.	Instructional quality (e.g., the instructors' skill in teaching)	1 2 3 4 5
3.	Testing and student assessment (e.g., number and fairness of tests)	1 2 3 4 5
4.	Quality of reading materials (e.g., appropriateness, interest level)	1 2 3 4 5
5.	The availability of help	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Quality of the reading lab	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Pace of instruction	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Overall quality of the course	1 2 3 4 5

Go To The Next Page

Directions: Below are some questions about other aspects of your life as a student related to your reading course. Please indicate your answer by **circling the number** in front of the appropriate response.

1. How many hours per week did you spend in studying for CS101?

   1 - Less than one hour
   2 - 1-2 hours
   3 - 3-4 hours
   4 - 5-6 hours
   5 - 7-8 hours
   6 - more than 8 hours

2. How motivated were you to study and learn from CS101?

   1 - Not at all motivated
   2 - Motivated a little bit
   3 - Motivated somewhat
   4 - Motivated a lot
   5 - Extremely motivated

3. How many hours per week did you spend in extracurricular activities (e.g., sports teams, clubs, student government).

   1 - None
   2 - 1-2 hours
   3 - 3-4 hours
   4 - 5-6 hours
   5 - 7-8 hours
   6 - more than 8 hours

THIS CONCLUDES THE SURVEY

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation. Please in turn your surveys according to the instructions you have received.

Appendix G

Student Information Questionnaire

Name ____________________ Social Security No. ________________

College ________________ Age _____ Date _____________________

Please check the appropriate box for each item below:

1. Sex:

_____Male
1

_____Female
0

2. Ethnicity (check one):

_____Black Non-Hispanic
1

_____White Non-Hispanic
2

_____Hispanic
3

_____Italian-American
4

_____Asian
5

_____Other ____________________
6

3. Language (check one):

___English
1

___Spanish
2

___French
3

___Creole
4

___Chinese
5

___Korean
6

___Italian
7

___Other___________
8

4. Family Income:

___Less than $8,000
1

___$16,000 - $23,999
3

___$8,001 - $15,999
2

___$24,000 or more
4

5. High School Average:

___70 or below
1

___71-80
2

___81-90
3

___91-99
4

6. Type of secondary school diploma:

___High School diploma ___GED
1 2

Excerpted from the CUNY Summer Basic Skills Program Student Information Sheet

Appendix H

Design Diagram

	Teacher	Method
Class One	1	S
Class Two	1	C
Class Three	2	C
Class Four	2	S

APPENDIX I

Collaborative Directions For Summarizing

The following list should be placed on the board before these directions are given:

1. Reduce lists- cross the list out and name it.
2. Use a topic sentence if one is written- underline it.
3. If there is no topic sentence, make up your own topic sentence and write it in the margin.
4. Cross out anything that is repeated.
5. Cross out anything that is unimportant.

"A summary is a shortened version of a story. It says basically the same thing as the original passage but it says it in fewer words. That is why it is called a summary. It is short. This is how you are going to do your summary." (Refer to the list on the board.)

"1. Reduce lists- if you see a list of things, try to think of a one or two word name for the list. For example, if you saw a list like eyes, ears, neck, arms, you could say "body parts." Write on the passage the name of the list and crass the list out.

2. Underline the topic sentence if one is written. Often authors write a sentence that summarizes a whole paragraph. It is called a topic sentence. If you find one, underline it.

3. Make up your own topic sentence. Unfortunately, not all paragraphs have topic sentences. If you don't see one to underline, then make one up and write it in the margin.
4. Get rid of repeated stuff. Go through the passage and cross out stuff that is repeated. Just get rid of it.
5. Get rid of unimportant stuff. Go through the passage and cross out stuff that is not important. Just get rid of it.

To remind yourself of what you are to do, be sure to look at this list on the board as you are doing your summary. Are there any questions?"

APPENDIX J

Collaborative Study Guides

PROLOGUE

1. What time is this prologue told in?

2. What is the meaning of the first two sentences?

3. Who is the speaker in the following quote?

   "They're sure I did it, but there were no witnesses and you wouldn't cooperate. Also, I don't think they can figure out how I could have hurt you."

4. Why is the following in quotation marks? "The truth."

5. What was Kevin's situation in the prologue?

KINDRED 5

1. Who is the speaker?
2. What is the time?
3. After the baby has been pulled out of the river what condition is the baby in? the mother?
4. Are there any noticeable similarities between mother and child?
5. What did Dana think of the name Rufus?
6. What response did the man have to this situation?
7. When Dana reappears, where does she find herself and what condition is she in?
8. What do Dana and Kevin try to do afterwards?
9. How long was she gone? Give two explanations - past and present.
10. At the end of page twelve, what does Dana allude to when she mentions my facts, your facts?
11. What possibility frightened Dana most?
12. How do Dana and Kevin deal with this experience?

KINDRED 6

1. On the second trip where does Dana find herself? Who is she with? Is the boy older?
2. Did Rufus know Dana was coming?
3. What impression do you have of Rufus' mother in this chapter?
4. What was Rufus doing when Dana arrived?
5. What is Rufus like as a person? How do you know?
6. Where does Dana find that she is located? Place and Time.
7. How does Dana find out about Alice? Who is she?
8. Why does Dana figure she is drawn to Rufus?
9. Why does Dana seek to find Alice's house?
10. What does Dana find upon her arrival at Alice's?
11. What happened to Dana while at Alice's house?
12. How does Dana get back to her time?
13. What is the antebellum south?
14. How does Rufus respond to what happened to Dana on her last trip?
15. How do Kevin and Dana determine that Dana is transported back to present under what circumstances?

KINDRED

pp. 108-154

1. What is another possible title for this episode?
2. How did Kevin and Dana's relatives react to them getting married?
3. What did the couple receive on their wedding day?
4. Compare the experience of Blacks and slavery to the Jewish experience during the holocaust.
5. Why did Dana contact her cousin? What did her cousin think?
6. What situation was Dana confronted with on this trip?
7. What was Alice's original name? Why did it change? What was her new name?
8. When Dana returned to the South, where was Kevin?
9. What was Rufus' tragic flaw regarding Alice?
10. Where was Margaret?
11. What did Rufus predict would happen to Alice and Isaac?
12. What was the slave's wedding ceremony like?
13. What was Rufus' impression of his father?
14. Did time vary in any way between the 1800s and the 1970s?
15. What was Dana's impression of the state of medical knowledge during the 1800s?
16. What happened to Nigel?
17. Who was Jake Edwards?
18. How did Tom Weylin regard Nigel's marriage?
19. Was Dana's letter to Kevin sent? Why? Why not?
20. What was Sarah's attitude toward her work?

21. What were Sarah's duties during Margaret's absence?

22. What were keloids?

23. What condition is Alice in when she is returned to the Weylin Plantation?

24. What is Alice's new situation?

25. Who is Miss Hannah?

KINDRED

pp. 154-188

1. Who was old Mary?
2. Explain this quote, "Rufus had let him hire his time."
3. Explain this quote, "I wonder how Carrie is doing - in all that pain, and not even able to scream." Who made this statement and why?
4. How does Carrie react to finding out that she is now a slave?
5. On pages 158-59, why was Dana preparing the meal rather than Sarah?
6. What did Alice feel toward Rufus once she regained her memory?
7. What was Carrie and Nigel's first baby's name?
8. How did Nigel feel the Weylin's secretly viewed the birth of his son?
9. How did Tom Weylin find out about the letter Rufus never sent?
10. Does Dana take pride in her work? Discuss.
11. Explain the following quote, "I know you Dana. You want Kevin the way I want Alice." Who makes this statement? Is it true?
12. What does Rufus trap Dana into doing?
13. Dana's relationship with Rufus and Alice was very complex. Discuss.
14. How did Alice treat Dana? Explain.
15. What were Alice's three choices?
16. Who makes the following quote, "I hoped the problem would never arise. If it did, one of us would do some cutting all right." (p. 164)
17. What was Carrie's usefulness to Tom Weylin?
18. How does Dana find out that Rufus tricked her with respect to the letter? What is her reaction?

19. How successful is Dana at finding Kevin?

20. What does Dana mean in the following quote, "See how easily slaves are made?"

21. Who informed the Weylin's of Dana's plan to escape?

22. Who wrote Kevin about Dana? Why?

23. Why did Rufus not write Dana?

24. How does Dana see her relationship with Rufus and Alice?

25. Who was Mr. Edwards?

26. How does Dana get back home?

KINDRED

PP. 189-239

1. How does Kevin relate to the 1970's after his five year exile?
2. On this trip, what new situation does Dana face?
3. What threat does Dana make to Tom?
4. What does Dana think Rufus might be sick with?
5. What precaution does she take?
6. What is a miasma?
7. Why does Tom threaten Dana regarding Rufus?
8. What is Tom's view of Dana?
9. How has Alice changed?
10. What happened to Tom Weylin?
11. Who does Rufus blame for what befell Tom?
12. How did the Weylin's doctor care for children with the fever?
13. Who does Alice blame for the loss of two of her children?
14. Who was Evan Fowler?
15. What are the similarities and differences between Rufus, Tom and Kevin?
16. What is Rufus' threat to Dana?
17. What is laudanum?
18. How has Margaret changed?
19. What did Margaret teach Dana?
20. Why was Dana being ostracized by the other slaves on the plantation?
21. What is a coffle?

22. What slave was sold? Why?

23. Where did Dana begin to go to avoid Rufus?

24. Who was Beth?

25. Explain the following quote, "Behold the woman, you really are only one woman. Did you know that?"

26. Who did Dana teach to read and write?

27. What does Alice want for her children? What were her plans?

28. Is Hagar born yet? What is the significance of this to Dana?

29. Who is Sam James?

30. How did Dana get home this time?

KINDRED

Directions: Identify any twenty of the following characters.

1. Julie -
2. Joe -
3. Rev. Wyndhan -
4. Sam James -
5. Sally -
6. Miss Hannah -
7. Old Mary -
8. Sarah -
9. Alice -
10. Nigel -
11. Rufus -
12. Carrie -
13. Hagar -
14. Luke -
15. Tom Weylin -
16. Virgil -
17. Isaac -
18. Jake Edwards -
19. Mr. Jennings -
20. Doc -
21. Margaret Weylin -
22. Carol -
23. Jude -
24. Evan Fowler -

Directions: Describe the relationships between each of the following pairs of persons in four or five sentences each.

1. Alice & Dana -
2. Margaret & Kevin -
3. Tom & Tess -
4. Sara & Carrie -
5. Kevin & Dana -
6. Tom & Dana -
7. Alice & Rufus -
8. Dana & Rufus -
9. Nigel & Carrie -
10. Tom & Miss Hannah -

Directions: Define each of the following terms:

1. keloids -

2. driver -

3. coffle -

4. patroller -

5. laudanum -

6. miasma -

7. ague -

8. overseer -

9. kindred -

10. pallet -

Directions: In short essay form discuss any two of the following themes:

A. blame and threats

B. Jewish experience compared to the Black American experience

C. slavery then and now

STUDY GUIDE

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

1. What is the purpose of the Prologue?
2. Describe the main character.
3. Describe the setting.

Chapter 1

1. Summarize Chapter 1.
2. What is meant by the term "foraging"?
3. Explain this statement. "I had run away from home but not from Harlem." (p. 4)
4. What does Piri witness during his excursion?
5. What disappointment does Piri feel regarding his father?

Chapter 2

1. What is "corazon"? Explain the concept.
2. Explain what the father is experiencing during the Great Depression?
3. Describe mother's Puerto Rican Paradise.
4. Name the five children.

Chapter 3

1. Summarize this chapter.
2. Who was Dopey? What became of him?
3. What does the term "reverie" mean?
4. How does Piri see himself relative to his father?
5. How does father treat the other children?

Chapter 4

1. Summarize this chapter.
2. Who was Ricardo? What happened to him?

3. Clarify what is meant by the expression "playing it smooth." (p. 40)

4. Who is speaking in the following quote? What is its significance? "Poppa...I ain't gonna cop out. I'm a fighter too."

5. Who does Piri blackmail? why?

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

pp 42 - 126

1. What is home relief?

2. Summarize Chapter 5, "Home Relief".

3. Explain the following quote: "I'm plastered in between Home Relief and the WPA?".

4. What do italics indicate in this novel?

5. Why does mother have Piri go to the WPA with her?

6. Explain the tone of the following quote: "...he started to read a stack of papers that had all our personal life put down in good English for all to dig."

7. What are the economic and social implications of the following quote: "Most of the vendors were Jewish, but they spoke Spanish like Puerto Ricans."

8. Where is the Thomas family's third residence?

9. What does the term cabron mean?

10. Explain the following quote: "Five seconds later my spurs were given to me in the form of introductions to streetdom's elite."

11. Explain the following quote: "In Harlem you always lived on the edge of losing rep. All it takes is a one-time loss of heart."

12. What are the names of the two gangs?

13. How does Piri feel about school? Why?

14. Who was Miss Shepard? What was her relationship with Piri?

15. Who was Miss Washington?

16. Explain the following quote: "...that corner spot wasn't mine alone. I had to earn it every time I shined shoes there."

17. Explain the following quote: "I calculated how long it would take to make my first million shining shoes. Too long, I would be something like 987 years old."

18. What were the young men's money making plans?

19. What is bolita?

20. Who was Marcia? How does Piri get his feelings hurt?

21. What is Piri's father's girlfriend's name?

22. Who was Betty?

23. Who was Pane?

24. Who was Lorry?

25. Who was Harold Christian?

26. Who was Trina?

27. Explain the term Marine Tiger?

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

pp. 127-180

1. Why was the family's last name "Thomas" rather than a typically Hispanic surname?
2. What is meant by the expression "playing the dozens"?
3. What were the ABC's that Brew's mother taught him?
4. Compare and contrast Piri and Brew's feelings toward white people.
5. Can you identify the ABC principle in the way Piri handled the incident with the girl on the train?
6. What is a brother?
7. Describe Piri's confrontation with Jose'. What caused this confrontation?
8. What is a prodigal son?
9. Why does Piri make reference in this chapter to a funeral? Whose funeral?
10. Why did Poppa change his name?
11. How did Poppa cope with racism in America?
12. Who was Alayce?
13. Compare the thinking of Alayce and Jose' about race.
14. Why did Brew leave the South years ago to come North?
15. How did Piri and Brew get the job with the National Maritime Union in Norfolk?
16. What was the Blue Bell?
17. What did Brew think of the waiter? Why? What was the waiter's name?
18. What is the waiter's genealogy? What does he feel about race and his own identity?
19. What is an octoroon?
20. Explain the following quote: "Gerald had problems something like me. Except that he was a Negro trying to make Puerto Rican and I am a Puerto Rican trying to

make Negro."

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

pp. 181 - 254

1. What is the name of the baar?
2. What is meant by the expression "the richness of their poverty?"
3. What is Brew's real name?
4. What is the waiter's name?
5. In the conversation between Piri, Brew and the waiter, what does it tell you about the waiter's character.
6. Explain the following metaphor: "I dug the jukebox and its ornament."
7. Explain the following quote: "...he was a Negro trying to make Puerto Rican and I was a Puerto Rican trying to make Negro."
8. Who is Lady Day?
9. What was the name of the ship that Piri and Brew worked on?
10. Explain each of the following terms: stewart, mate, slop chest, port side, portholes, aft, galley.
11. What were the first three stops for the Merchant ship Piri is on?
12. What is an octoroon?
13. What is the cathouse?
14. Discuss the situation between Piri, Isaac and the Swede.
15. When and why did Piri realize his desire to kill?
16. When Piri returns from his trip around the world, what are his feelings and what situation does he face?
17. What race is Piri's father's girlfriend?
18. Why does Piri turn to drugs?
19. Who was Turkey?
20. What drug is Piri hooked on?

21. Who helped Piri kick the habit?
22. Why did Piri want to quit?

23. Is drug addiction psychological, physiological or both?

24. Who was the real Jesse James?

25. Who was Louie?

26. Who is Piri's conscience?

27. Summarize the car heist?

28. Explain the following metaphor: "I threw the wad of bills on the table. They stuck together with the old man's glue."

29. Where did each of the four robbers go after this heist?

30. What was the nature of Piri's relationship with Chino's cousin? What was her name?

31. What was the name of the offspring?

32. What happened to Louie?

33. Summarize the night club heist?

34. How many people were shot?

35. When Piri was being prepared for this operation, what did he compare the sedation to?

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

pp. 255 - 303

1. Who was Jimmy?
2. What are the Tombs?
3. Why did Piri feel Louie was a chota?
4. How long did Piri wait for trial?
5. What was Piri's full name?
6. What was Piri's conviction?
7. What was Louie's sentence?
8. What is a hack?
9. What is a POW?
10. Who was John Philip Sousa?
11. What is a shank?
12. What does the expression "you're on a boat" mean?
13. After Piri is taken into custody, what four institutions is he taken to?
14. Describe life in the joint as Piri experienced it.
15. What was the pecking order among prisoners?
16. Who was Claude and Big Jules' relationship?
17. What was Tico's real name?
18. Who was Rube? Who was Tico?
19. What becomes of Piri's relationship with Trina?
20. Why did the inmates strike?
21. Why was there a riot at Comstock?
22. Describe Piri's relationship with the priest.

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

pp. 308 - 354

1. What is the Quran?
2. Who was Muhammad?
3. What religion was Piri's mother?
4. Explain what Piri means in the following quote: "Learning made me painfully aware of life and me."
5. Who was Big Cot?
6. When Piri is granted parole is he rehabilitated?
7. Does Piri accept prison as his home?
8. What hardship does Trina experience in her marriage? In child birth?
9. What was the last prison Piri was in?
10. What was Piri's first job after getting out of prison?
11. What became of Carlita?
12. What is a bolero?

DOWN THESE MEAN STREETS

EXAMINATION

I. ESSAY

This autobiography records the development of a young man of Puerto Rican descent to manhood. Discuss the development of Piri as a child, an adolescent, and an adult.

Piri is a young man with an identity crisis. Discuss Piri's crisis racially, culturally, and within his family.

Piri is hung-up between two sticks in a number of ways. Discuss three of them.

II. Define the following terms:

1. forage
2. ukulele
3. hijo
4. cabron
5. bolita
6. jim crow
7. dozens
8. malice
9. Cain & Abel
10. Prodigal Son
11. Blue Bell
12. Lady Day
13. octoroon
14. imam
15. corazon
16. Castilian
17. swarthy
18. maudlin
19. chameleon
20. James Clifford

III. Identify the following characters:

A. List and identify the five members of Piri's family:

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

B. Dopey

C. Carlito
D. Waneko

E. Concha

F. Alfredo

G. Miss Shepard

H. Miss Washington

I. Paulie

J. Ruthie

K. Betty

L. Pane

M. Lorry

N. Mr. Harold Christian

O. Louie

P. Marine Tiger

Q. Brew

R. Crutch

S. Alayce

T. Billie

U. Danny

V. El Viejo

W. Charles Andrew West

X. Isaac

Y. Dulcien

Z. Turkey

aa. Chino

bb. Pedro Luis

cc. POW

dd. Kent

ee. Clarence
ff. Claude

gg. Rube

IV. Explain the following quotes:

a. "...girl and me and train got to the station at the same time."

b. "In Harlem stealing was like natural - and usually a partnership."

c. "that corner spot wasn't mine alone. I had to earn it every time I shined shoes there."

d. "I think you're yellow not because you didn't kill him but because you didn't want to kill him."

e. "I stood there staring down into that uncovered hole in the ground."

APPENDIX K

Skills Course Syllabus

Unit One Vocabulary

1. Building a Strong Vocabulary
   - a. How to Find Out What Words Mean
   - b. How to Remember New Words
2. Recognizing Word Meanings
   - a. Context Clues
   - b. Word Part Clues
   - c. Denotation and Connotation
   - d. Shades of Meaning
3. Using a Dictionary
   - a. The Guide Words
   - b. The Main Entry
   - c. The Pronunciation Key
   - d. The Parts of Speech
   - e. Special Forms and Special Spellings
   - f. The Meaning of the Word
   - g. The History of the Word

Unit Two Comprehension

4. Reading Aids
   - a. Skimming
   - b. Previewing
   - c. Previewing Long Material: the Parts of the Book
5. Reading for the Main Idea
   - a. Key Ideas in Sentences

        b. Main Ideas in Paragraphs

    6. Reading for Information

        a. Fact-Finding

        b. Major Details, Minor Details

    7. Recognizing Paragraph Patterns

        a. Ordering of Ideas

        b. Listing Details

        c. Comparison and Contrast

        d. Cause and Effect

Unit Three Interpretation And Evaluation

    8. Making Inferences

    9. Understanding Figurative Language

    10. Drawing Conclusions and Predicting Outcomes

    11. Generalizing

    12. Evaluating Ideas

        a. Facts and Opinions

        b. Evidence

        c. Your Opinion

    d. The Writer's Technique

    e. Techniques that Twist the Truth

Unit Four The Basic Study Skills

13. Underlining Taking Notes, Outlining

    a. Underlining

    b. Taking Notes

    c. Outlining

14. Summarizing

  - a. Writing Summaries by Paragraphs
  - b. Writing Summaries of Long Passages

15. Understanding Exam Questions
    - a. Preparing for Examinations
    - b. Short-Answer Questions
    - c. Essay Questions
16. Reading Selections

Appendix L

Structural Triads

Tests	Bot Grp	n	sd.	Mid Grp	n	sd.	Top Grp	n	sd.
Pre-DTLS	15.60	15	5.14	16.61	18	3.81	19.24	17	4.04
Post-DTLS	17.40	15	2.59	22.89	18	2.11	34.21	17	4.61
Diff1	2.20	15	4.43	6.28	18	3.71	14.88	17	3.55
Pre-SDRT	5.06	15	2.17	7.43	18	1.45	10.52	17	1.93
Post-SDRT	5.69	15	1.61	8.07	18	1.87	12.03	17	2.05
Diff2	.64	15	1.45	.64	18	1.30	1.51	17	2.24

Appendix M

Frequencies and Distributions of Students by Class on Background Variables

(n=50)

Variables	Class 1 n=11	Class 2 n=16	Class 3 n=12	Class 4 n=11
Age				
range	16-30	17-4	20-35	18-27
mean	20	21	20	21
Sex				
male	6	6	4	5
female	5	10	8	6
Ethnicity				
Black	4	9	4	4
Hispanic	5	6	6	5
White	1	0	1	2
Other	1	1	1	0
First Language				
English	5	6	4	5
Spanish	3	5	5	4
French	0	2	1	1
Creole	3	0	0	0
Other	0	3	2	1
Income				
<$8,000	1	6	2	3
$8,001-15,999	2	2*	2	1
$16,000-23,999	5*	6	4*	4*
$24,000+	3	2	4	3
High School Average				
<70	3	3	1	2
71-80	5	10	10	5
81-90	3	2	1	4
91-99	0	1	0	0
Diploma				
High School	11	14	10	9
G.E.D.	0	2	2	2

Appendix N

Cell Means SDRT

ANCOVA - Post-SDRT - By Method - Teacher with Pre-SDRT

Total Population

8.40
(50)

Method

1	2
8.11 (28)	8.77 (22)

Teacher

A	B
9.38 (23)	7.57 (27)

		Teacher	
		A	B
Method	1	9.38 (12)	7.16 (16)
	2	9.37 (11)	8.16 (11)

Appendix O

Ancova Table - DTLS

Sources of Variation	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig of F
Covariates	742.793	1	742.793	16.690	.000
Pre-DTLS	742.793	1	742.793	16.680	.000
Main Effects	32.989	1	32.989	.741	.394
Teacher	32.989	1	32.989	.741	.394
Explained	2898.820	2	387.891	8.710	.001
Residual	2093.038	47	44.533		
Total	2868.820	49	58.547		

Covariate Raw Regression Coefficient .865

Multiple R Squared .270